arXiv:1704.00281v1 [math.LO] 2 Apr 2017

NONSTANDARD ANALYSIS AND CONSTRUCTIVISM!

SAM SANDERS

Abstract. Almost two decades ago, Wattenberg published a paper with the title *Nonstandard Analysis and Constructivism?* in which he speculates on a possible connection between Nonstandard Analysis and constructive mathematics. We study Wattenberg's work in light of recent research on the aforementioned connection. On one hand, with only slight modification, some of Wattenberg's theorems in Nonstandard Analysis are seen to yield effective and constructive theorems (not involving Nonstandard Analysis). On the other hand, we establish the incorrectness of some of Wattenberg's (explicit and implicit) claims regarding the constructive status of the axioms *Transfer* and *Standard Part* of Nonstandard Analysis.

1. Introduction

The introduction of Wattenberg's paper [37] includes the following statement:

> This is a speculative paper. For some time the author has been struck by an apparent affinity between two rather unlikely areas of mathematics - nonstandard analysis and constructivism. [...] The purpose of this paper is to investigate these ideas by examining several examples. ([37, p. 303])

In a nutshell, the aim of this paper is to study Wattenberg's results in light of recent results on the computational content of Nonstandard Analysis as in [28–31].

First of all, *similar* observations concerning the constructive content of Nonstandard Analysis have been made before, e.g. as follows:

> It has often been held that nonstandard analysis is highly nonconstructive, thus somewhat suspect, depending as it does upon the ultrapower construction to produce a model [...] On the other hand, nonstandard *praxis* is remarkably constructive; having the extended number set we can proceed with explicit calculations. (Emphasis in original: [1, p. 31])

Like-minded statements may be found in [9, 11, 21–25, 32, 34, 36, 38]. The reader may interpret the word *constructive* as the mainstream/classical notion 'effective', or as the foundational notion from Bishop's *Constructive Analysis* ([5]). As will become clear, both cases will be treated below (and separated carefully).

However, Wattenberg goes further than most of the aforementioned authors by making the following important observation.

Munich Center for Mathematical Philosophy, LMU Munich, Germany & Department of Mathematics, Ghent University

E-mail address: sasander@me.com.

Key words and phrases. Nonstandard Analysis, constructive mathematics, computational content.

> Despite an essential nonconstructive kernel, many nonstandard arguments are constructive until the final step, a step that frequently involves the standard part map. ([37, p. 303])

This observation is similar to Osswald's *local constructivity*. In particular, Osswald has qualified the observation from the above quotes as *Nonstandard Analysis is locally constructive*, to be understood as the fact that the mathematics performed in the nonstandard world is highly constructive[1]. By contrast, the nonstandard axioms (*Transfer* and *Standard Part*) needed to 'jump between' the nonstandard world and usual mathematics, are *highly non-constructive* in general. Osswald discusses local constructivity in [38, §7], [21, §1-2], or [22, §17.5].

The results in [28–31] vindicate the Wattenberg and Osswald view in that computational content is extracted from theorems of 'pure' Nonstandard Analysis, i.e. formulated solely with the *nonstandard* definitions (of continuity, Riemann integration, compactness, et cetera) rather than the 'ε-δ' definitions. With this choice, one only works in the nonstandard universe, avoiding the non-constructive step from and to the standard/usual universe (requiring *Transfer* and *Standard Part*).

In this paper, we show that Wattenberg's results from [37] yield effective and constructive results with only slight modification. However, we also establish the incorrectness of Wattenberg's claims regarding the constructive status of the nonstandard axioms *Transfer* and *Standard Part*. In contrast to Wattenberg, we shall work in Nelson's axiomatic approach to Nonstandard Analysis (See Section 2), but this change of framework will have no real impact on our results or Wattenberg's.

2. Internal set theory and its fragments

In this section, we discuss Nelson's *internal set theory*, first introduced in [18], and its fragments P and H from [3]. The latter fragments are essential to our enterprise, especially Theorem 2.4 below.

2.1. **Internal set theory 101.** In Nelson's *syntactic* approach to Nonstandard Analysis ([18]), as opposed to Robinson's semantic one ([26]), a new predicate '$\mathrm{st}(x)$', read as 'x is standard' is added to the language of ZFC, the usual foundation of mathematics. The notations $(\forall^{\mathrm{st}}x)$ and $(\exists^{\mathrm{st}}y)$ are short for $(\forall x)(\mathrm{st}(x) \to \dots)$ and $(\exists y)(\mathrm{st}(y) \wedge \dots)$. A formula is called *internal* if it does not involve 'st', and *external* otherwise. The three external axioms *Idealisation*, *Standard Part*, and *Transfer* govern the new predicate 'st'. These axioms are respectively defined[2] as:

- $\mathsf{(I)}$ $(\forall^{\mathrm{st\ fin}}x)(\exists y)(\forall z \in x)\varphi(z,y) \to (\exists y)(\forall^{\mathrm{st}}x)\varphi(x,y)$, for internal φ.
- $\mathsf{(S)}$ $(\forall^{\mathrm{st}}x)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}}y)(\forall^{\mathrm{st}}z)\big((z \in x \wedge \varphi(z)) \leftrightarrow z \in y\big)$, for any φ.
- $\mathsf{(T)}$ $(\forall^{\mathrm{st}}t)\big[(\forall^{\mathrm{st}}x)\varphi(x,t) \to (\forall x)\varphi(x,t)\big]$, where $\varphi(x,t)$ is internal, and only has free variables t, x.

The system IST is (the internal system) ZFC extended with the aforementioned external axioms; The former is a conservative extension of ZFC for the internal language, as proved in [18]. Clearly, the extension from ZFC to IST can be done for other systems, and we are interested in the formalisations of (classical and

[1]The mathematics performed in the nonstandard world usually amounts to merely manipulating sums and products of nonstandard length.

[2]The superscript 'fin' in $\mathsf{(I)}$ means that x is finite, i.e. its number of elements are bounded by a natural number.

intuitionistic) arithmetic, namely *Peano* and *Heyting* arithmetic. In this regard, the systems H and P from [3], also sketched in the next sections, are nonstandard extensions of the (internal) logical systems $\mathsf{E}\text{-}\mathsf{HA}^\omega$ and $\mathsf{E}\text{-}\mathsf{PA}^\omega$, respectively *Heyting and Peano arithmetic in all finite types and the axiom of extensionality*. We refer to [12, §3.3] for the exact definitions of the (mainstream in mathematical logic) systems $\mathsf{E}\text{-}\mathsf{HA}^\omega$ and $\mathsf{E}\text{-}\mathsf{PA}^\omega$.

2.2. **The classical system P.** In this section, we introduce the system P, a conservative extension of Peano arithmetic with fragments of Nelson's IST.

To this end, recall that $\mathsf{E}\text{-}\mathsf{PA}^{\omega*}$ and $\mathsf{E}\text{-}\mathsf{HA}^{\omega*}$ are the definitional extensions of $\mathsf{E}\text{-}\mathsf{PA}^\omega$ and $\mathsf{E}\text{-}\mathsf{HA}^\omega$ with types for finite sequences, as in [3, §2]. For the former systems, we require some notation.

Notation 2.1 (Finite sequences)**.** The systems $\mathsf{E}\text{-}\mathsf{PA}^{\omega*}$ and $\mathsf{E}\text{-}\mathsf{HA}^{\omega*}$ have a dedicated type for 'finite sequences of objects of type ρ', namely ρ^*. Since the usual coding of pairs of numbers goes through in both, we shall not always distinguish between 0 and 0^*. Similarly, we do not always distinguish between 's^ρ' and '$\langle s^\rho \rangle$', where the former is 'the object s of type ρ', and the latter is 'the sequence of type ρ^* with only element s^ρ'. The empty sequence for the type ρ^* is denoted by '$\langle\rangle_\rho$', usually with the typing omitted. Furthermore, we denote by '$|s| = n$' the length of the finite sequence $s^{\rho^*} = \langle s_0^\rho, s_1^\rho, \dots, s_{n-1}^\rho \rangle$, where $|\langle\rangle| = 0$, i.e. the empty sequence has length zero. For sequences s^{ρ^*}, t^{ρ^*}, we denote by '$s * t$' the concatenation of s and t, i.e. $(s*t)(i) = s(i)$ for $i < |s|$ and $(s*t)(j) = t(|s| - j)$ for $|s| \leq j < |s| + |t|$. For a sequence s^{ρ^*}, we define $\overline{s}N := \langle s(0), s(1), \dots, s(N) \rangle$ for $N^0 < |s|$. For a sequence $\alpha^{0 \to \rho}$, we also write $\overline{\alpha}N = \langle \alpha(0), \alpha(1), \dots, \alpha(N) \rangle$ for *any* N^0. By way of shorthand, $q^\rho \in Q^{\rho^*}$ abbreviates $(\exists i < |Q|)(Q(i) =_\rho q)$. Finally, we shall use $\underline{x}, \underline{y}, \underline{t}, \dots$ as short for tuples $x_0^{\sigma_0}, \dots x_k^{\sigma_k}$ of possibly different type σ_i.

We can now introduce $\mathsf{E}\text{-}\mathsf{PA}^{\omega*}_{\mathrm{st}}$. We use the same definition as [3, Def. 6.1], where $\mathsf{E}\text{-}\mathsf{PA}^{\omega*}$ is the definitional extension of $\mathsf{E}\text{-}\mathsf{PA}^\omega$ with types for finite sequences from [3, §2]. The set $\mathcal{T}^*$ is the collection of all the terms in the language of $\mathsf{E}\text{-}\mathsf{PA}^{\omega*}$.

Definition 2.2. The system $\mathsf{E}\text{-}\mathsf{PA}^{\omega*}_{\mathrm{st}}$ is defined as $\mathsf{E}\text{-}\mathsf{PA}^{\omega*} + \mathcal{T}^*_{\mathrm{st}} + \mathsf{IA}^{\mathrm{st}}$, where $\mathcal{T}^*_{\mathrm{st}}$ consists of the following *basic* axiom schemas.

(1) The schema[3] $\mathrm{st}(x) \wedge x = y \to \mathrm{st}(y)$,
(2) The schema providing for each closed[4] term $t \in \mathcal{T}^*$ the axiom $\mathrm{st}(t)$.
(3) The schema $\mathrm{st}(f) \wedge \mathrm{st}(x) \to \mathrm{st}(f(x))$.

The external induction axiom $\mathsf{IA}^{\mathrm{st}}$ is as follows.

$$\Phi(0) \wedge (\forall^{\mathrm{st}} n^0)(\Phi(n) \to \Phi(n+1)) \to (\forall^{\mathrm{st}} n^0)\Phi(n). \tag{$\mathsf{IA}^{\mathrm{st}}$}$$

Secondly, we introduce some essential fragments of IST studied in [3].

Definition 2.3. [External axioms of P]

[3]The language of $\mathsf{E}\text{-}\mathsf{PA}^{\omega*}_{\mathrm{st}}$ contains a symbol st_σ for each finite type σ, but the subscript is essentially always omitted. Hence $\mathcal{T}^*_{\mathrm{st}}$ is an *axiom schema* and not an axiom.

[4]A term is called *closed* in [3] (and in this paper) if all variables are bound via lambda abstraction. Thus, if $\underline{x}, \underline{y}$ are the only variables occurring in the term t, the term $(\lambda \underline{x})(\lambda \underline{y})t(\underline{x}, \underline{y})$ is closed while $(\lambda \underline{x})t(\underline{x}, \underline{y})$ is not. The second axiom in Definition 2.2 thus expresses that $\mathrm{st}_\tau\big((\lambda \underline{x})(\lambda \underline{y})t(\underline{x}, \underline{y})\big)$ if $(\lambda \underline{x})(\lambda \underline{y})t(\underline{x}, \underline{y})$ is of type τ. We usually omit lambda abstraction for brevity.

(1) $\mathsf{HAC}_{\mathsf{int}}$: For any internal formula φ, we have
$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x^{\rho})(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} y^{\tau})\varphi(x,y) \to \big(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} F^{\rho\to\tau^*}\big)(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x^{\rho})(\exists y^{\tau}\in F(x))\varphi(x,y), \tag{2.1}$$
(2) I: For any internal formula φ, we have
$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x^{\sigma^*})(\exists y^{\tau})(\forall z^{\sigma}\in x)\varphi(z,y) \to (\exists y^{\tau})(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x^{\sigma})\varphi(x,y),$$
(3) The system P is $\mathsf{E\text{-}PA}^{\omega *}_{\mathrm{st}} + \mathsf{I} + \mathsf{HAC}_{\mathsf{int}}$.

Note that I and $\mathsf{HAC}_{\mathsf{int}}$ are fragments of Nelson's axioms *Idealisation* and *Standard part*. By definition, F in (2.1) only provides a *finite sequence* of witnesses to $(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} y)$, explaining its name *Herbrandized Axiom of Choice*.

The system P is connected to $\mathsf{E\text{-}PA}^{\omega}$ by Theorem 2.4. The latter (which is not present in [3]) expresses that we may obtain effective results as in (2.3) from any theorem of Nonstandard Analysis which has the same form as in (2.2).

Theorem 2.4. *If Δ_{int} is a collection of internal formulas and ψ is internal, and*
$$\mathsf{P} + \Delta_{\mathsf{int}} \vdash (\forall^{\mathrm{st}} \underline{x})(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} \underline{y})\psi(\underline{x},\underline{y},\underline{a}), \tag{2.2}$$
then one can extract from the proof a sequence of closed[4] *terms t in $\mathcal{T}^*$ such that*
$$\mathsf{E\text{-}PA}^{\omega *} + \Delta_{\mathsf{int}} \vdash (\forall \underline{x})(\exists \underline{y}\in t(\underline{x}))\psi(\underline{x},\underline{y},\underline{a}). \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. See e.g. [30, §2] or [29, §2]. □

For the rest of this paper, the notion 'normal form' shall refer to a formula as in (2.2), i.e. of the form $(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} y)\varphi(x,y)$ for φ internal. It is shown in [29–31] that the scope of Theorem 2.4 includes the 'Big Five' systems of Reverse Mathematics and the associated 'zoo' from [7].

Finally, the previous theorems do not really depend on the presence of full Peano arithmetic. We shall study the following subsystems.

Definition 2.5. [Weaker Systems]

(1) Let $\mathsf{E\text{-}PRA}^{\omega}$ be the system defined in [13, §2] and let $\mathsf{E\text{-}PRA}^{\omega *}$ be its definitional extension with types for finite sequences as in [3, §2].
(2) ($\mathsf{QF\text{-}AC}^{\rho,\tau}$) For every quantifier-free internal formula $\varphi(x,y)$, we have
$$(\forall x^{\rho})(\exists y^{\tau})\varphi(x,y) \to (\exists F^{\rho\to\tau})(\forall x^{\rho})\varphi(x,F(x)) \tag{2.4}$$
(3) The system RCA^{ω}_0 is $\mathsf{E\text{-}PRA}^{\omega} + \mathsf{QF\text{-}AC}^{1,0}$.

The system RCA^{ω}_0 is the 'base theory of higher-order Reverse Mathematics' as introduced in [13, §2]. We permit ourselves a slight abuse of notation by also referring to the system $\mathsf{E\text{-}PRA}^{\omega *} + \mathsf{QF\text{-}AC}^{1,0}$ as RCA^{ω}_0.

Corollary 2.6. *The previous theorem and corollary go through for* P *and* $\mathsf{E\text{-}PA}^{\omega *}$ *replaced by* $\mathsf{P}_0 \equiv \mathsf{E\text{-}PRA}^{\omega *} + \mathcal{T}^*_{\mathrm{st}} + \mathsf{HAC}_{\mathsf{int}} + \mathsf{I} + \mathsf{QF\text{-}AC}^{1,0}$ *and* RCA^{ω}_0.

Proof. The proof of [3, Theorem 7.7] goes through for any fragment of $\mathsf{E\text{-}PA}^{\omega *}$ which includes EFA, sometimes also called $\mathsf{I}\Delta_0 + \mathsf{EXP}$. In particular, the exponential function is (all what is) required to 'easily' manipulate finite sequences. □

We now discuss the *Standard Part* principle $\Omega\text{-}\mathsf{CA}$, a very practical consequence of the axiom $\mathsf{HAC}_{\mathsf{int}}$. Intuitively speaking, $\Omega\text{-}\mathsf{CA}$ expresses that we can obtain the standard part (in casu G) of Ω-*invariant* nonstandard objects (in casu $F(\cdot, M)$). Note that we write '$N \in \Omega$' as short for $\neg\mathrm{st}(N^0)$.

Definition 2.7. [Ω-invariance] Let $F^{(\sigma\times 0)\to 0}$ be standard and fix $M^0 \in \Omega$. Then $F(\cdot, M)$ is **Ω-invariant** if

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x^\sigma)(\forall N^0 \in \Omega)\big[F(x,M) =_0 F(x,N)\big]. \tag{2.5}$$

Principle 2.8 (Ω-CA)**.** Let $F^{(\sigma\times 0)\to 0}$ be standard and fix $M^0 \in \Omega$. For every Ω-invariant $F(\cdot, M)$, there is a standard $G^{\sigma\to 0}$ such that

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x^\sigma)(\forall N^0 \in \Omega)\big[G(x) =_0 F(x,N)\big]. \tag{2.6}$$

The axiom Ω-CA provides the standard part of a nonstandard object, if the latter is *independent of the choice of nonstandard number* used in its definition. The following theorem is not new, but highly instructive in light of Remark 2.10.

Theorem 2.9. *The system* P_0 *proves* Ω-CA.

Proof. Let $F(\cdot, M^0)$ be Ω-invariant, i.e. we have

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x^\sigma)(\forall N^0, M^0 \in \Omega)\big[F(x,M) =_0 F(x,N)\big]. \tag{2.7}$$

By underspill (See Theorem 2.13 below), we immediately obtain that

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x^\sigma)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} k^0)(\forall N^0, M^0 \geq k)\big[F(x,M) =_0 F(x,N)\big].$$

Now apply $\mathsf{HAC}_{\mathsf{int}}$ to obtain standard $\Phi^{\sigma\to 0^*}$ such that

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x^\sigma)(\exists k^0 \in \Phi(x))(\forall N^0, M^0 \geq k)\big[F(x,M) =_0 F(x,N)\big].$$

Next, define $\Psi(x) := \max_{i<|\Phi(x)|} \Phi(x)(i)$ and note that

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x^\sigma)(\forall N^0, M^0 \geq \Psi(x))\big[F(x,M) =_0 F(x,N)\big].$$

Finally, put $G(x) := F(x, \Psi(x))$ and note that Ω-CA follows. □

Finally, we consider the following remark on how $\mathsf{HAC}_{\mathsf{int}}$ and I are used.

Remark 2.10 (Using $\mathsf{HAC}_{\mathsf{int}}$ and I)**.** By definition, $\mathsf{HAC}_{\mathsf{int}}$ produces a functional $F^{\sigma\to\tau^*}$ which outputs a *finite sequence* of witnesses. However, $\mathsf{HAC}_{\mathsf{int}}$ provides an actual *witnessing functional* assuming (i) $\tau = 0$ in $\mathsf{HAC}_{\mathsf{int}}$ and (ii) the formula φ from $\mathsf{HAC}_{\mathsf{int}}$ is 'sufficiently monotone' as in: $(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x^\sigma, n^0, m^0)\big([n \leq_0 m \wedge \varphi(x,n)] \to \varphi(x,m)\big)$. Indeed, in this case one simply defines $G^{\sigma\to 0}$ by $G(x^\sigma) := \max_{i<|F(x)|} F(x)(i)$ which satisfies $(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x^\sigma)\varphi(x, G(x))$, as was done in the proof of Theorem 2.9. To save space in proofs, we will sometimes skip the (obvious) step involving the maximum of finite sequences, when applying $\mathsf{HAC}_{\mathsf{int}}$. We assume the same convention for terms obtained from Theorem 2.4, and applications of the contraposition of *Idealisation* I.

2.3. **The constructive system H.** In this section, we define the system H, the constructive counterpart of P. The system H was first introduced in [3, §5.2], and constitutes a conservative extension of Heyting arithmetic $\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^\omega$ by [3, Cor. 5.6].

Similar to Definition 2.2, we define $\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^{\omega *}_{\mathrm{st}}$ as $\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^{\omega *} + \mathcal{T}^*_{\mathrm{st}} + \mathsf{IA}^{\mathrm{st}}$, where $\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^{\omega *}$ is essentially just $\mathsf{E\text{-}PA}^{\omega *}$ without the law of excluded middle. Furthermore, define

$$\mathsf{H} \equiv \mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^{\omega *}_{\mathrm{st}} + \mathsf{HAC} + \mathsf{I} + \mathsf{NCR} + \mathsf{HIP}_{\forall^{\mathrm{st}}} + \mathsf{HGMP}^{\mathrm{st}},$$

where HAC is $\mathsf{HAC}_{\mathsf{int}}$ without any restriction on the formula, and where the remaining axioms are defined in the following definition.

Definition 2.11. [Three axioms of H]

(1) $\mathsf{HIP}_{\forall^{\mathrm{st}}}$

$$[(\forall^{\mathrm{st}}x)\phi(x) \to (\exists^{\mathrm{st}}y)\Psi(y)] \to (\exists^{\mathrm{st}}y')[(\forall^{\mathrm{st}}x)\phi(x) \to (\exists y \in y')\Psi(y)],$$

where $\Psi(y)$ is any formula and $\phi(x)$ is an internal formula of $\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^{\omega *}$.

(2) $\mathsf{HGMP}^{\mathrm{st}}$

$$[(\forall^{\mathrm{st}}x)\phi(x) \to \psi] \to (\exists^{\mathrm{st}}x')[(\forall x \in x')\phi(x) \to \psi]$$

where $\phi(x)$ and ψ are internal formulas in the language of $\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^{\omega *}$.

(3) NCR

$$(\forall y^{\tau})(\exists^{\mathrm{st}}x^{\rho})\Phi(x,y) \to (\exists^{\mathrm{st}}x^{\rho^*})(\forall y^{\tau})(\exists x' \in x)\Phi(x',y),$$

where Φ is any formula of $\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^{\omega *}$

Intuitively speaking, the first two axioms of Definition 2.11 allow us to perform a number of *non-constructive operations* (namely *Markov's principle* and *independence of premises*) on the standard objects of the system H, provided we introduce a 'Herbrandisation' as in the consequent of HAC, i.e. a finite list of possible witnesses rather than one single witness. Furthermore, while H includes *Idealisation* I, one often uses the latter's *classical contraposition*, explaining why NCR is useful (and even essential) in the context of intuitionistic logic.

Surprisingly, the axioms from Definition 2.11 are exactly what is needed to convert nonstandard definitions (of continuity, integrability, convergence, et cetera) into the normal form $(\forall^{\mathrm{st}}x)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}}y)\varphi(x,y)$ for internal φ, as done in [29, §3.1]. The latter normal form plays an equally important role in the constructive case as in the classical case by the following theorem.

Theorem 2.12. *If Δ_{int} is a collection of internal formulas, φ is internal, and*

$$\mathsf{H} + \Delta_{\mathsf{int}} \vdash \forall^{\mathrm{st}}\underline{x}\,\exists^{\mathrm{st}}\underline{y}\,\varphi(\underline{x},\underline{y},\underline{a}), \tag{2.8}$$

then one can extract from the proof a sequence of closed terms t in $\mathcal{T}^*$ such that

$$\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^{\omega *} + \Delta_{\mathsf{int}} \vdash \ \forall\underline{x}\,\exists\underline{y} \in \underline{t}(\underline{x})\ \varphi(\underline{x},\underline{y},\underline{a}). \tag{2.9}$$

Proof. Immediate by [3, Theorem 5.9]. Note that in the latter, just like in the proof of Corollary 2.4, $\forall^{\mathrm{st}}\underline{x}\,\exists^{\mathrm{st}}\underline{y}\,\varphi(\underline{x},\underline{y},\underline{a})$ is proved to be 'invariant' under a suitable syntactic translation. □

Finally, we point out some very useful principles to which we have access.

Theorem 2.13. *The systems* P, P_0, *and* H *prove* overspill *and* underspill, *i.e.*

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}}x^{\rho})\varphi(x) \to (\exists y^{\rho})\big[\neg\mathrm{st}(y) \wedge \varphi(y)\big] \text{ and } (\forall x^{\rho})\big[\neg\mathrm{st}(x) \to \varphi(x)\big] \to (\exists^{\mathrm{st}}y^{\rho})\varphi(y),$$

for any internal formula φ.

Proof. Immediate by [3, Prop. 3.3 and 5.11]. □

We will apply underspill most frequently as follows: From $(\forall M \in \Omega)\psi(M)$ for internal ψ, we conclude that $(\forall K^0)\big[\neg\mathrm{st}(K) \to (\forall M \geq K)\psi(M)\big]$. Applying underspill for $\varphi(K) \equiv (\forall M \geq K)\psi(M)$, we obtain $(\exists^{\mathrm{st}}K^0)(\forall M \geq K)\psi(M)$.

In conclusion, we have introduced the systems H, P, which are conservative extensions of Peano and Heyting arithmetic with fragments of Nelson's internal set theory. We have observed that central to the conservation result in Theorem 2.4 is the normal form $(\forall^{\mathrm{st}}x)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}}y)\varphi(x,y)$ for internal φ.

2.4. **Notations.** In this section, we introduce notations relating to H and P.

First of all, we mostly use the same notations as in [3].

Remark 2.14 (Notations)**.** We write $(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x^\tau)\Phi(x^\tau)$ and $(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} x^\sigma)\Psi(x^\sigma)$ as short for $(\forall x^\tau)\big[\mathrm{st}(x^\tau) \to \Phi(x^\tau)\big]$ and $(\exists x^\sigma)\big[\mathrm{st}(x^\sigma) \wedge \Psi(x^\sigma)\big]$. We also write $(\forall x^0 \in \Omega)\Phi(x^0)$ and $(\exists x^0 \in \Omega)\Psi(x^0)$ as short for $(\forall x^0)\big[\neg\mathrm{st}(x^0) \to \Phi(x^0)\big]$ and $(\exists x^0)\big[\neg\mathrm{st}(x^0) \wedge \Psi(x^0)\big]$. Furthermore, $\neg\mathrm{st}(x^0)$, is abbreviated by '$x^0 \in \Omega$'. A formula A is 'internal' if it does not involve st, and 'external' otherwise. The formula A^{st} is defined from A by appending 'st' to all quantifiers (except bounded number quantifiers).

Secondly, we will use the usual notations for natural, rational and real numbers and functions as introduced in [13, p. 288-289]. We only list the definition of real number and related notions in P and related systems.

Definition 2.15 (Real numbers and related notions in P)**.**

(1) A (standard) real number x is a (standard) fast-converging Cauchy sequence $q^1_{(\cdot)}$, i.e. $(\forall n^0, i^0)(|q_n - q_{n+i})| <_0 \frac{1}{2^n})$. We use Kohlenbach's 'hat function' from [13, p. 289] to guarantee that every sequence f^1 is a real.
(2) We write $[x](k) := q_k$ for the k-th approximation of a real $x^1 = (q^1_{(\cdot)})$.
(3) Two reals x, y represented by $q_{(\cdot)}$ and $r_{(\cdot)}$ are *equal*, denoted '$x =_{\mathbb{R}} y$', if $(\forall n)(|q_n - r_n| \leq \frac{1}{2^{n-1}})$. Inequality '$<_{\mathbb{R}}$' is defined similarly.
(4) We write '$x \approx y$' if $(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} n)(|q_n - r_n| \leq \frac{1}{2^{n-1}})$ and $x \gg y$ if $x > y \wedge x \not\approx y$.
(5) Functions $F : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ mapping reals to reals are represented by functionals $\Phi^{1\to 1}$ mapping equal reals to equal reals, i.e.
$$(\forall x, y)(x =_{\mathbb{R}} y \to \Phi(x) =_{\mathbb{R}} \Phi(y)). \tag{RE}$$
(6) For a space X with metric $|\cdot|_X : X \to \mathbb{R}$, we write '$x \approx y$' for '$|x-y|_X \approx 0$'.
(7) Sets of objects of type ρ are denoted $X^{\rho\to 0}, Y^{\rho\to}, Z^{\rho\to 0}, \dots$ and are given by their characteristic functions $f_X^{\rho\to 0}$, i.e. $(\forall x^\rho)[x \in X \leftrightarrow f_X(x) =_0 1]$, where $f_X^{\rho\to 0}$ is assumed to output zero or one.

Thirdly, we use the usual extensional notion of equality.

Remark 2.16 (Equality)**.** All the above systems include equality between natural numbers '$=_0$' as a primitive. Equality '$=_\tau$' for type τ-objects x, y is defined as:
$$[x =_\tau y] \equiv (\forall z_1^{\tau_1} \dots z_k^{\tau_k})[xz_1 \dots z_k =_0 yz_1 \dots z_k] \tag{2.10}$$
if the type τ is composed as $\tau \equiv (\tau_1 \to \dots \to \tau_k \to 0)$. Inequality '$\leq_\tau$' is then just (2.10) with '$=_0$' replaced by '$\leq_0$'. In the spirit of Nonstandard Analysis, we define 'approximate equality $\approx_\tau$' as follows:
$$[x \approx_\tau y] \equiv (\forall^{\mathrm{st}} z_1^{\tau_1} \dots z_k^{\tau_k})[xz_1 \dots z_k =_0 yz_1 \dots z_k] \tag{2.11}$$
with the type τ as above. All the above systems include the *axiom of extensionality*:
$$(\forall x^\rho, y^\rho, \varphi^{\rho\to\tau})\big[x =_\rho y \to \varphi(x) =_\tau \varphi(y)\big]. \tag{E}$$
However, as noted in [3, p. 1973], the so-called axiom of *standard* extensionality $(\mathsf{E})^{\mathrm{st}}$ is problematic and cannot be included in our systems. We use $(\mathsf{E})_{n+2}$ to refer to (E) restricted to type $n+2$ functionals φ.

2.5. **Preliminaries.** In this section, we introduce the usual defintions of continuity, as well as some fragments of *Transfer* and *Standard Part*, their normal forms, and the functionals arising from term extraction as in Theorem 2.4.

2.5.1. *Continuity, nonstandard and otherwise.*

Definition 2.17. [Continuity] A function f is *continuous* on $[0,1]$ if

$$(\forall k^0)(\forall x\in[0,1])(\exists N^0)\big[(\forall y\in[0,1])(|x-y|<_{\mathbb{R}}\tfrac{1}{N}\to|f(x)-f(y)|<_{\mathbb{R}}\tfrac{1}{k})\big]. \tag{2.12}$$

A function f is *nonstandard continuous* on $[0,1]$ if

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x\in[0,1])(\forall y\in[0,1])[x\approx y\to f(x)\approx f(y)]. \tag{2.13}$$

A function f is *uniformly continuous* on $[0,1]$ if

$$(\forall k^0)(\exists N^0)\big[(\forall x,y\in[0,1])(|x-y|<_{\mathbb{R}}\tfrac{1}{N}\to|f(x)-f(y)|<_{\mathbb{R}}\tfrac{1}{k})\big]. \tag{2.14}$$

A function f is *nonstandard uniformly continuous* on $[0,1]$ if

$$(\forall x,y\in[0,1])[x\approx y\to f(x)\approx f(y)]. \tag{2.15}$$

Definition 2.18. [Modulus of continuity]

(1) A function g which provides N as in (2.12) (resp. (2.14)) for any k^0 and $x^1\in[0,1]$ (resp. for k^0) is a *modulus* of pointwise (resp. uniform) continuity.
(2) We write $f\in C([0,1])$ (resp. $f\in C^{\mathrm{st}}([0,1])$) for (2.12) (resp. $(2.12)^{\mathrm{st}}$).
(3) The principle NSC_1 (resp. NSC_2) is the statement that every standard $f\in C([0,1])$ (resp. standard $f\in C^{\mathrm{st}}([0,1])$) is also nonstandard continuous.
(4) The principle $\mathsf{MPC}(\Xi)$ is the statement that $\Xi(f)$ is a modulus of pointwise continuity for every $f\in C([0,1])$.

As will become clear in Section 3.2, there is an intimate connection between nonstandard continuity (2.13) and a 'modulus-of-continuity functional' Ξ as in $\mathsf{MPC}(\Xi)$.

2.5.2. *Transfer and comprehension.* We require two equivalent (See [13, Prop. 3.9]) versions of arithmetical comprehension:

$$(\exists\mu^2)\big[(\forall f^1)((\exists n)f(n)=0\to f(\mu(f))=0)\big], \tag{μ^2}$$

$$(\exists\varphi^2)\big[(\forall f^1)((\exists n)f(n)=0\leftrightarrow\varphi(f)=0\big], \tag{$\exists^2$}$$

and also the restriction of Nelson's axiom *Transfer* as follows:

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} f^1)\big[(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} n^0)f(n)\neq0\to(\forall m)f(m)\neq0\big]. \tag{Π^0_1-TRANS}$$

Denote by $\mathsf{MU}(\mu)$ the formula in square brackets in (μ^2). By the following theorems, Π^0_1-TRANS is fundamentally non-constructive and closely related to arithmetical comprehension as given by (μ^2).

Theorem 2.19. *The system* P *proves* $(\exists^{\mathrm{st}}\mu^2)\mathsf{MU}(\mu)\to\Pi^0_1$-TRANS $\to(\mu^2)^{\mathrm{st}}$.

Proof. The first implication is immediate as standard functionals produce standard output on standard input by the third basic axiom in Definition 2.2. In particular, $\mu(f)$ is standard for standard f^1 if μ^2 is standard. For the second implication, note that Π^0_1-TRANS implies by contraposition that:

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} f^1)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} m)\big[(\exists n^0)f(n)=0\to(\exists i\leq m)f(i)=0\big]. \tag{2.16}$$

Applying $\mathsf{HAC}_{\mathsf{int}}$ while bearing in mind Remark 2.10, we obtain standard Φ s.t.

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} f^1)\big[(\exists n^0)f(n)=0\to(\exists i\leq\Phi(f))f(i)=0\big], \tag{2.17}$$

which immediately yields $(\mu^2)^{\mathrm{st}}$, and we are done. □

Theorem 2.20. *From the proof that* $\mathsf{P}_0\vdash[\mathsf{NSC}_1\to\Pi^0_1$-TRANS$]$*, a term* t *can be extracted such that* $\mathsf{RCA}^\omega_0\vdash(\forall\Xi^3)\big(\mathsf{MPC}(\Xi)\to\mathsf{MU}(t(\Xi))\big)$

Proof. See the proof of Corollary 3.10. □

By the previous theorem, term extraction as in Theorem 2.4 converts Π_1^0-TRANS into (μ^2), i.e. the former fragment of *Transfer* is rather non-constructive.

Finally, we should point out that it is possible to obtain (some) computational information from (non-constructive) proofs in classical mathematics, even involving comprehension. This is the domain of *proof mining*, to which Kohlenbach's monograph [12] provides an excellent introduction. Thus, our use of 'X is non-constructive' should be interpreted as the observation that X is rejected in (parts of) constructive mathematics, while X may have implicit constructive content, which can be brought out using proof mining. In fact, we will use a technique from proof theory to obtain computational content from *Standard Part* in Section 4.2.

2.5.3. *Standard Part and related functionals.* We shall make use of the following fragments of the *Standard Part* axiom:

$$(\forall \alpha^1 \leq_1 1)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} \beta^1 \leq_1 1)(\alpha \approx_1 \beta), \tag{STP}$$

$$(\forall x \in [0,1])(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} y \in [0,1])(x \approx y). \tag{$\mathsf{STP}_{\mathbb{R}}$}$$

These fragments are both equivalent to the following by Theorem 4.4 below:

$$(\forall T^1 \leq_1 1)\big[(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} n)(\exists \beta^0)(|\beta| = n \wedge \beta \in T) \to (\exists^{\mathrm{st}} \alpha^1 \leq_1 1)(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} n^0)(\overline{\alpha} n \in T)\big] \tag{2.18}$$

where '$T \leq_1 1$' denotes that T is a binary tree. Clearly, (2.18) is a nonstandard version of *weak König's lemma*, and the latter is a compactness principle by [33, IV].

As it happens, STP and $\mathsf{STP}_{\mathbb{R}}$ express the nonstandard compactness of Cantor space and the unit interval by *Robinson's theorem* in [10, p. 43]. Furthermore, (2.18) is equivalent to the following normal form:

$$\begin{aligned}(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} g^2)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} w^{1^*})(\forall T^1 \leq_1 1)(\exists (\alpha^1 \leq_1 1,\, k^0) \in w)\big[(\overline{\alpha} g(\alpha) \notin T) \\ \to (\forall \beta \leq_1 1)(\exists i \leq k)(\overline{\beta} i \notin T)\big]\end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

as shown below in Theorem 4.4. Term extraction as in Theorem 2.4 converts (2.19) to the following 'special fan functional'.

Definition 2.21. [Special fan functional]

$$\begin{aligned}(\forall g^2, T^1 \leq_1 1)\big[(\forall \alpha^1 \in \Theta(g)(2))(\alpha \leq_1 1 \to \overline{\alpha} g(\alpha) \notin T) \to \\ (\forall \beta \leq_1 1)(\exists i \leq_0 \Theta(g)(1))(\overline{\beta} i \notin T)\big].\end{aligned} \tag{$\mathsf{SCF}(\Theta)$}$$

Any functional $\Theta^{2 \to (1^* \times 0)}$ satisfying $\mathsf{SCF}(\Theta)$ is called a *special fan functional* and the latter object was first introduced in [28]. Note that there is no unique such Θ, i.e. it is in principle incorrect to talk about 'the' special fan functional.

The computability-theoretic properties of the special fan functional are studied in [20, 28]. Intuitionistically, a special fan functional Θ can be computed (via a term in Gödel's T; see Theorem 4.9) in terms of the *intuitionistic fan functional* Ω as in $\mathsf{MUC}(\Omega)$ (See e.g. [13, §3] for the latter) defined as follows:

$$(\forall Y^2)(\forall f^1, g^1 \leq_1 1)(\overline{f}\Omega(Y) = \overline{g}\Omega(Y) \to Y(f) = Y(g)). \tag{$\mathsf{MUC}(\Omega)$}$$

Classically, Θ can be computed (Kleene's S1-S9 from [16, §5.1.1]) by ξ as in $(\mathcal{E}_2)$:

$$(\exists \xi^3)(\forall Y^2)\big[(\exists f^1)(Y(f) = 0) \leftrightarrow \xi(Y) = 0\big]. \tag{$\mathcal{E}_2$}$$

but Θ cannot be computed (Kleene S1-S9) from any type two functional, which includes rather non-computable functionals like (μ^2) and the Suslin functional. With regard to first order-strength, $\mathsf{RCA}_0^\omega + (\exists \Theta)\mathsf{SCF}(\Theta)$ is a conservative extension of $\mathsf{RCA}_0^2 + \mathsf{WKL}$ by [13, Prop. 3.15]. All these results may be found in [20].

In conclusion, the special fan functional has rather weak first-order strength, while it is extremely hard to compute (compared to e.g. the computational strength of the Big Five systems of Reverse Mathematics). As will become clear in Section 4.2, the special fan functional still provides plenty of computational content after applying an extra (algorithmic) step.

3. The intermediate value theorem

We discuss Wattenberg's treatment from [37, II] of the intermediate value theorem inside Nonstandard Analysis.

3.1. **Introduction and preliminaries.** The intermediate value theorem (IVT) is a basic result from calculus and is usually formulated as follows.

Theorem 3.1 (IVT)**.** *Suppose that $f : [a,b] \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and such that $f(a) <_{\mathbb{R}} 0 <_{\mathbb{R}} f(b)$. Then there is $x \in [a,b]$ such that $f(x) =_{\mathbb{R}} 0$.*

As is well-known, IVT implies a non-trivial fragment of the law of excluded middle (See e.g. [2, I.7] or [17]) and is therefore rejected in constructive mathematics. The following 'approximate' IVT is described as 'constructive' by Wattenberg ([37, II.2]).

Theorem 3.2 ($\mathsf{IVT}_\bullet$)**.** *Suppose that $\varepsilon >_{\mathbb{R}} 0$ and $f : [a,b] \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and such that $f(a) <_{\mathbb{R}} 0 <_{\mathbb{R}} f(b)$. Then there is $x \in [a,b]$ such that $|f(x)| <_{\mathbb{R}} \varepsilon$.*

On one hand, a slight modification of Wattenberg's nonstandard proof of IVT will be shown to yield the following *effective* version of IVT in Section 3.2.

Theorem 3.3 ($\mathsf{IVT}_{\mathsf{ef}}(s)$)**.** *For k^0 and $f : [a,b] \to \mathbb{R}$ uniformly continuous with modulus g and such that $f(a) <_{\mathbb{R}} 0 <_{\mathbb{R}} f(b)$, we have $|f(s(f,g,k))| <_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{k}$.*

Note that this version no longer involves Nonstandard Analysis. Furthermore, the term s is 'read off' from the (modified) Wattenberg proof. Thus, Wattenberg's claims about the effective content of Nonstandard Analysis do seem to hold water.

One the other hand, some of Wattenberg's (explicit and implicit) claims regarding the constructive status of the nonstandard axioms *Transfer* and *Standard Part* will be shown to be incorrect. In particular, Wattenberg suggests that *Standard Part* is fundamentally non-constructive (See [37, p. 303] and Section 1), but freely (either explicitly or implicitly) makes use of *Transfer*. We show that *Transfer* as used by Wattenberg is fundamentally non-constructive in Section 3.3, while the constructive status of *Standard Part* is discussed in Section 3.4.

3.2. **Constructive IVT and Nonstandard Analysis.** Wattenberg proves the classical IVT inside Nonstandard Analysis in [37, II.3] using the following steps:

(i) Define $x_j := a + jh$ for $h := \frac{b-a}{N}$ where N^0 is a nonstandard number.
(ii) Let j_0 be the largest j such that $f(x_j) \leq_{\mathbb{R}} 0$.
(iii) Since $f(x_{j_0}) \leq_{\mathbb{R}} 0 \leq_{\mathbb{R}} f(x_{j_0+1})$ and $x_{j_0} \approx x_{j_0+1}$, we have $f(x_{j_0}) \approx 0$.
(iv) Let standard $t_0 \in [0,1]$ be such that $t_0 \approx x_{j_0}$ and conclude $f(t_0) =_{\mathbb{R}} 0$.

Note that item (iii) makes use of *uniform* nonstandard continuity, while item (iv) makes use of STP to obtain t_0. According to Wattenberg ([37, p. 303]), the final step of the proof is non-constructive (as it involves STP) and should therefore be omitted. Following this approach, the previous steps immediately yield Theorem 3.4 where $t^{((1\to 1)\times 0)\to 0}$ is defined as follows (with the real $h := \frac{b-a}{N}$):

$$t(f,N) := \begin{cases} (\mu j \leq N)\big([f(jh)](2^N) \leq_0 0\big)h & \text{if such exists} \\ N+1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \tag{3.1}$$

Theorem 3.4 ($\mathsf{IVT}_{\mathsf{wat}}$)**.** *For nonstandard N^0 and nonstandard uniformly continuous $f : [a,b] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(a) <_{\mathbb{R}} 0 <_{\mathbb{R}} f(b)$, $t(f,N) \in [a,b] \wedge f(t(f,N)) \approx 0$.*

Note that t does not implement item (ii), but only an *approximation* up to nonstandard precision. This is however *equally good* in light of nonstandard (uniform) continuity from item (iii). It should be noted that Wattenberg observes this problem with item (ii) as well in [37, p. 304]. He proposes to replace '$\leq_{\mathbb{R}}$' by '$\lessapprox$' in [37, II.6], which is however not a decidable[5] predicate either.

We have the following theorem where it should be noted that $\mathsf{IVT}_{\mathsf{wat}}$ does not have an obvious normal form (to apply Theorem 2.4).

Theorem 3.5. *From the proof of $\mathsf{IVT}_{\mathsf{wat}}$ in P_0, a term u can be extracted such that RCA_0^ω proves $\mathsf{IVT}_{\mathsf{ef}}(u)$.*

Proof. The proof of $\mathsf{IVT}_{\mathsf{wat}}$ in P_0 follows immediately from the definition of t in (4.11) and steps (i)-(iii) above. We now convert $\mathsf{IVT}_{\mathsf{wat}}$ into a normal form so that we can apply Theorem 2.4; we assume $a = 0$ and $b = 1$ for simplicity. Thus, let $A(f,k,N)$ be the conjunction of $f(0) <_{\mathbb{R}} 0 <_{\mathbb{R}} f(1)$ and the formula in square brackets in (2.14), and note that $(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} k^0)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} N^0)A(f,k,N)$ implies that f is continuous as in (2.15). In this way, $\mathsf{IVT}_{\mathsf{wat}}$ implies that for $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} k^0)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} M^0)A(f,k,M) \to (\forall N \in \Omega)(t(f,N) \in [0,1] \wedge f(t(f,N)h/N) \approx 0),$$

which immediately yields by resolving '$\approx$' that

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} k^0)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} M^0)A(f,k,M) \to (\forall^{\mathrm{st}} l^0)(\forall N \in \Omega)\big[t(f,N) \in [0,1] \wedge |f(t(f,N)h/N)| < \tfrac{1}{l}\big],$$

where we abbreviate the formula in square brackets by $B(f,N,l)$. Applying underspill to $(\forall N \in \Omega)B(f,N,l)$, we obtain $(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} l^0)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} n^0)(\forall N \geq n)B(f,N,l)$. Thus, $\mathsf{IVT}_{\mathsf{wat}}$ implies that for all $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\big[(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} k)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} M)A(f,k,M) \to (\forall^{\mathrm{st}} l)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} n)(\forall N \geq n)B(f,N,l)\big], \tag{3.2}$$

and, since standard functionals yield standard output on standard input, we have for all $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ that

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} g^1)\big[(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} k^0)A(f,k,g(k)) \to (\forall^{\mathrm{st}} l^0)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} n^0)(\forall N \geq n)B(f,N,l)\big]. \tag{3.3}$$

By strengthening the antecedent, the previous formula yields:

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} g)(\forall f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R})\big[(\forall k)A(f,k,g(k)) \to (\forall^{\mathrm{st}} l)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} n)(\forall N \geq n)B(f,N,l)\big]. \tag{3.4}$$

[5]It should be noted that the constructive system H proves the 'lesser limited principle of omniscience' LLPO relative to 'st' ([3, §3.1]) which implies $(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x \in \mathbb{R})(x \lessapprox 0 \vee x \gtrapprox 0)$, i.e. an instance of the law of excluded middle relative to 'st'. However, the decision procedure for the latter follows easily from the constructive fact that $(\forall x \in \mathbb{R})(x \geq_{\mathbb{R}} 0 \vee x \leq_{\mathbb{R}} a)$ for $0 <_{\mathbb{R}} a \approx 0$.

Now bring outside all standard quantifiers as far as possible to obtain:

$$(\forall^{\text{st}} g, l)(\forall f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R})(\exists^{\text{st}} n)\big[(\forall k^0)A(f,k,g(k)) \to (\forall N \geq n)B(f,N,l)\big]. \quad (3.5)$$

Let $C(g,l,f,n)$ be the formula in square brackets in the previous formula. Apply *Idealisation* I, while bearing in mind Remark 2.10, to push the standard quantifier involving n to the front as follows:

$$(\forall^{\text{st}} g^1, l^0)(\exists^{\text{st}} n^0)(\forall f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R})C(g,l,f,n). \quad (3.6)$$

Now apply Theorem 2.4 to '$\mathsf{P} \vdash$ (3.6)' to obtain a term s such that $\mathsf{E\text{-}PA}^{\omega *}$ proves

$$(\forall^{\text{st}} g^1, l^0)(\exists n^0 \in s(g,l))(\forall f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R})C(g,l,f,n). \quad (3.7)$$

Define $u(f,g,k) := t(f, \max_{i<|s(g,k)|} s(g,k)(i))$ and note that $\mathsf{IVT}_{\mathsf{ef}}(u)$. □

The previous proof serves as a template for obtaining computational content from Nonstandard Analysis as follows. The below proofs follow this template and we will therefore not always go in as much detail as in the previous proof.

Template 3.6 (Computational content of Nonstandard Analysis)**.**

(i) Bring all sub-formulas into a normal form like in (3.2).
(ii) Push all standard quantifiers to the front as follows:
  (ii.a) If necessary, introduce standard functionals like g in (3.3) and drop 'st' in the antecedent like in (3.4).
  (ii.b) If necessary, use *Idealisation* (like for (3.5)) to pull standard quantifiers through normal quantifiers.
(iii) Obtain a normal form like (3.6) and apply Theorem 2.4 using Remark 2.10.

Furthermore, there is a subtlety involved in the formulation of $\mathsf{IVT}_{\mathsf{wat}}$ as follows.

Remark 3.7 (On Ω-invariance)**.** By definition, $t(f,N)$ from $\mathsf{IVT}_{\mathsf{wat}}$ is such that $f(t(f,N)) \approx 0$ for any $N \in \Omega$. However, if f has multiple intermediate values, i.e. there are $x, y \in [0,1]$ such that $f(x) \approx f(y) \approx 0$ but $x \not\approx y$, then it is possible that $t(f,N) \not\approx t(f,M)$ for $N, M \in \Omega$. In other words, we cannot use Ω-CA to obtain a *standard* intermediate value of f.

As it turns out, the proof of the theorem also goes through constructively, as follows. This is far from obvious as the proof seems to involve non-constructive steps like the independence of premise principle to go from (3.4) to (3.5).

Corollary 3.8. *From the proof of* $\mathsf{IVT}_{\mathsf{wat}}$ *in* H*, a term* u *can be extracted such that* $\mathsf{E\text{-}HA}^{\omega *}$ *proves* $\mathsf{IVT}_{\mathsf{ef}}(u)$*.*

Proof. Clearly, the above proof of $\mathsf{IVT}_{\mathsf{wat}}$ goes through in H. Furthermore, one easily derives (3.7) from $\mathsf{IVT}_{\mathsf{wat}}$ in H. Indeed, the steps leading up to (3.4) clearly go through in H. For the step from (3.4) to (3.5), the '$(\forall^{\text{st}} l)$' quantifier can be brought to the front in intuitionistic logic, and the same can then be done for the quantifier '$(\exists^{\text{st}} n)$' using the axiom $\mathsf{HIP}_{\forall^{\text{st}}}$ from Definition 2.11, while bearing in mind Remark 2.10 as usual. Having obtained (3.5), one applies NCR to obtain (3.6), again bearing in mind Remark 2.10. Finally, one applies Theorem 2.12 to '$\mathsf{H} \vdash$ (3.6)' to obtain the required term. □

In conclusion, Wattenberg's claim that Nonstandard Analysis has effective (even constructive) content seems correct in light of Theorem 3.5 and its corollary.

3.3. **Non-constructivity arising from continuity.** In this section, we deal with the exact connection between nonstandard and ε-δ-continuity. We are motivated by the observation that Wattenberg uses the (provable using *Transfer*) equivalence between nonstandard and ε-δ-continuity without a second thought in [37, III.3].

By the following theorem and Theorem 2.19, any step from ε-δ-continuity to nonstandard continuity, i.e. NSC_1 and NSC_2 in Definition 2.18, implies a non-trivial fragment of *Transfer* and is therefore fundamentally *non-constructive*.

Theorem 3.9. *The systems* $\mathsf{P}_0 + \mathsf{NSC}_2$ *and* $\mathsf{P} + \mathsf{NSC}_1$ *both prove* Π^0_1-TRANS.

Proof. For the first part, we work in $\mathsf{P}_0 + \mathsf{NSC}_2$. Thus, fix standard $f_0 \in C^{\mathrm{st}}([0,1])$ and suppose $\neg\Pi^0_1$-TRANS, i.e. there is standard h^1_0 such that $(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} n) h_0(n) = 0$ and $(\exists m_0) h(m_0) \neq 0$. Let $\mathbb{b}^1$ be such that $\mathbb{b}(q) = q$ if $q^0 \neq 0$ and 1 otherwise. Now define standard f_1 as follows: $f_1(x) = f_0(x)$ if $\big(\forall n^0 \leq \frac{1}{\mathbb{b}([x](1))}\big)(h_0(n) = 0)$, and $f_0(x) + 1$ otherwise. Since for a standard real $x \in [0,1]$, the rational $[x](n)$ is standard for standard n^0, we have $(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x \in [0,1])(f_0(x) =_{\mathbb{R}} f_1(x))$, and hence $f_1 \in C^{\mathrm{st}}([0,1])$ by definition. However, f_1 is not nonstandard continuous since:

$$f_1(0) =_{\mathbb{R}} f_0(0) \not\approx f_0(0) + 1 \approx f_0(\tfrac{1}{2^N}) + 1 =_{\mathbb{R}} f_1(\tfrac{1}{2^N})$$

for large enough nonstandard N^0. This contradiction finishes the first part.

For the second part, we work in $\mathsf{P}_0 + \mathsf{NSC}_1$. Suppose $\neg\Pi^0_1$-TRANS, i.e. there is standard h^1_0 such that $(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} n) h_0(n) = 0$ and $(\exists m_0) h(m_0) \neq 0$. Define the standard real x_0 as $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{h(n)}{2^n}$. Since $0 \approx x_0 >_{\mathbb{R}} 0$ the standard function $f_2(x) := \frac{1}{|x| + x_0}$ is clearly well-defined and continuous (as in $f_2 \in C([0,1])$). However, $f_2(x_0) = \frac{1}{2x_0} \not\approx \frac{1}{x_0} =_{\mathbb{R}} f_2(0)$ implies that f_2 is not nonstandard continuous. This contradiction yields Π^0_1-TRANS, and we are done. □

Recall the definition of 'modulus-of-continuity-functional' from Definition 2.18.

Corollary 3.10. *From the proof that* $\mathsf{P}_0 \vdash \mathsf{NSC}_1 \to \Pi^0_1$-$\mathsf{TRANS}$*, a term* t *can be extracted such that* $\mathsf{RCA}^{\omega}_0 \vdash (\forall \Xi^3)\big(\mathsf{MPC}(\Xi) \to \mathsf{MU}(t(\Xi))\big)$

Proof. A normal form for Π^0_1-TRANS is given by (2.17), where we use $A(f,n)$ to denote the formula in square brackets. A normal form for nonstandard pointwise continuity (2.13) is obtained as follows. Resolving '$\approx$' in (2.13), we obtain

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x \in [0,1])(\forall y \in [0,1])\big((\forall^{\mathrm{st}} N)(|x-y| < \tfrac{1}{N}) \to (\forall^{\mathrm{st}} k)(|f(x) - f(y)| < \tfrac{1}{k})\big).$$

We may bring out the '$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} k)$' and '$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} N)$' quantifiers as follows:

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x \in [0,1])(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} k)\underline{(\forall y \in [0,1])(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} N)\big(|x-y| < \tfrac{1}{N} \to |f(x) - f(y)| < \tfrac{1}{k}\big)}.$$

Applying *Idealisation* I to the underlined formula, we obtain a standard z^{0^*} such that $(\forall y \in [0,1])(\exists N \in z)$ in the previous formula. Now let N_0 be the maximum of all numbers in z, and note that for $N = N_0$, we have the following:

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x \in [0,1])(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} k)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} N)(\forall y \in [0,1])\big(|x-y| < \tfrac{1}{N} \to |f(x) - f(y)| < \tfrac{1}{k}\big),$$

abbreviated by $(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x \in [0,1], k)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} N) B(x,k,N,f)$. Hence, $\mathsf{NSC}_1 \to \Pi^0_1$-$\mathsf{TRANS}$ is

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} g \in C([0,1]))(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x \in [0,1], k)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} N) B(x,k,N,g) \to (\forall^{\mathrm{st}} f^1)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} n^0) A(f,n),$$

which implies (since standard functionals have standard output for standard input):

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} \Psi)\big[(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} g \in C([0,1]))(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x \in [0,1], k) B(x,k,\Psi(x,k,g),g) \to (\forall^{\mathrm{st}} f^1)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} n^0) A(f,n)\big],$$

and dropping the 'st' in the antecedent, we obtain:

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}}\Psi)\big[(\forall g\in C([0,1]),x\in[0,1],k)B(x,k,\Psi(x,k,g),g)\to(\forall^{\mathrm{st}}f^1)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}}n^0)A(f,n)\big],$$

and bringing the standard quantifiers up front, we finally have

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}}\Psi,f)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}}n)\big[(\forall g\in C([0,1]),x\in[0,1],k)B(x,k,\Psi(x,k,g),g)\to A(f,n)\big]. \quad (3.8)$$

Applying Theorem 2.4 to '$\mathsf{P}_0\vdash(3.8)$', we obtain a term t such that

$$(\forall\Psi,f)(\exists n\in t(\Psi,f))\big[(\forall g\in C([0,1]),x\in[0,1],k)B(x,k,\Psi(x,k,g),g)\to A(f,n)\big].$$

which is exactly as required in light of the definition of A,B and Remark 2.10. □

By the previous theorem and corollary, NSC_1 translates to the existence of a modulus-of-continuity-functional when applying Theorem 2.4. Such a functional is fundamentally non-constructive by the corollary, and this non-constructiveness 'trickles down' to any nonstandard theorem of $\mathsf{P}_0+\mathsf{NSC}_1$ as follows.

Corollary 3.11. *Let φ be internal. From $\mathsf{P}_0+\mathsf{NSC}_1\vdash(\forall^{\mathrm{st}}x)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}}y)\varphi(x,y)$, a term t can be extracted such that $\mathsf{RCA}_0^\omega\vdash(\forall\Xi^3)\big(\mathsf{MPC}(\Xi)\to(\forall x)(\exists y\in t(x,\Xi))\varphi(x,y)\big)$.*

Proof. Analogous to the proof of the previous corollary following Template 3.6 □

The previous theorem and corollaries imply that the step from ε-δ continuity (relative to 'st' or not) to the nonstandard variety always involves a non-trivial instance of *Transfer*, which is fundamentally non-constructive. In particular, by Corollary 3.11, any result proved using NSC_1 only provides computational information *involving a non-constructive modulus-of-continuity-functional*. In general, moving from the standard into the nonstandard world is highly non-constructive (requiring *Transfer*), as was sketched in Section 1 in the form of Osswald's *local constructivity*. Nonetheless, Wattenberg freely uses *Transfer* and the equivalence between 'ε-δ' and nonstandard continuity in [37, II-III]. This aspect of his investigation into the computational content of Nonstandard Analysis thus seems incorrect.

Furthermore, as suggested by its proof, Theorem 3.9 goes through for other notions besides continuity. We now show, for differentiability and Riemann integration, that the step from the ε-δ definition to the nonstandard one yields Π^0_1-TRANS.

First of all, we have the usual definition of differentiability.

Definition 3.12. A function f is *nonstandard differentiable* at a if

$$(\forall\varepsilon,\varepsilon'\neq0)\big(\varepsilon,\varepsilon'\approx0\to\tfrac{f(a+\varepsilon)-f(a)}{\varepsilon}\approx\tfrac{f(a+\varepsilon')-f(a)}{\varepsilon'}\big). \quad (3.9)$$

A function f is *differentiable* at a if

$$(\forall k^0)(\exists N^0)(\forall\varepsilon,\varepsilon')\big(0<|\varepsilon|,|\varepsilon'|<\tfrac{1}{N}\to\big|\tfrac{f(a+\varepsilon)-f(a)}{\varepsilon}-\tfrac{f(a+\varepsilon')-f(a)}{\varepsilon'}\big|<\tfrac{1}{k}\big). \quad (3.10)$$

A 'modulus of differentiability at a' is a function g^1 such that $g(k)$ is N^0 in (3.10).

Let NSD be the statement *any standard $f:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ differentiable at zero is also nonstandard differentiable there*. Now, NSD is a theorem of IST but we also have the following implication.

Theorem 3.13. *The system $\mathsf{P}+\mathsf{NSD}$ proves Π^0_1-TRANS.*

Proof. Working in $\mathsf{P}+\mathsf{NSD}$, suppose we have $\neg\Pi^0_1$-TRANS, i.e. there is standard h^1_0 such that $(\forall^{\mathrm{st}}n)h_0(n)=0$ and $(\exists m_0)h(m_0)\neq 0$. Define the standard real x_0 as in the proof of Theorem 3.9. Since $0\approx x_0>_{\mathbb{R}}0$ the standard function $f_0(x):=e^{\frac{1}{x^2+x_0}}$ is well-defined and differentiable in the usual internal 'epsilon-delta' sense. However,

$$\tfrac{f_0(\sqrt{x_0})-f_0(0)}{\sqrt{x_0}}=\tfrac{e^{\frac{1}{2x_0}}-e^{\frac{1}{x_0}}}{\sqrt{x_0}}=e^{\frac{1}{x_0}}\tfrac{e^{\frac{1}{x_0}}-1}{\sqrt{x_0}}\gg 0\gg e^{\frac{1}{x_0}}\tfrac{e^{\frac{1}{x_0}}-1}{-\sqrt{x_0}}=\tfrac{e^{\frac{1}{2x_0}}-e^{\frac{1}{x_0}}}{-\sqrt{x_0}}=\tfrac{f_0(-\sqrt{x_0})-f_0(0)}{-\sqrt{x_0}}$$

which implies that f_0 is not nonstandard differentiable at zero. This contradiction yields Π^0_1-TRANS, and we are done. □

Let $\mathsf{DIF}(\Xi)$ be the statement that $\Xi(f)$ is a modulus for differentiability at zero for every f differentiable at zero.

Corollary 3.14. *From the proof that* $\mathsf{P}\vdash\mathsf{NSD}\to\Pi^0_1$-$\mathsf{TRANS}$*, a term* t *can be extracted such that* $\mathsf{E\text{-}PA}^\omega\vdash(\forall\Xi^3)\big(\mathsf{DIF}(\Xi)\to\mathsf{MU}(t(\Xi))\big)$

Proof. A normal form for differentiability as in (3.9) is easy to obtain and as follows:

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}}k^0)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}}N^0)(\forall\varepsilon,\varepsilon'\neq 0)\big(|\varepsilon|,|\varepsilon'|<\tfrac{1}{N}\to\left|\tfrac{f(a+\varepsilon)-f(a)}{\varepsilon}-\tfrac{f(a+\varepsilon')-f(a)}{\varepsilon'}\right|<\tfrac{1}{k}\big),$$

The proof is straightforward and analogous to the proof of Corollary 3.10. □

Hence, switching from epsilon-delta differentiability to the nonstandard variety as in NSD is at least as non-constructive as (μ^2) and NSC_1. One readily obtains a version of $\mathsf{NSC}_2\to\Pi^0_1$-TRANS for NSD, i.e. for ε-δ-differentiability relative to 'st'.

Next, we consider the usual definitions of Riemann integration.

Definition 3.15. [Riemann Integration]

(1) A *partition* of $[0,1]$ is an increasing sequence $\pi=(0,t_0,x_1,t_1,\dots,x_{M-1},t_{M-1},1)$. We write '$\pi\in P([0,1])$' to denote that π is such a partition.
(2) For $\pi\in P([0,1])$, $\|\pi\|$ is the *mesh*, i.e. the largest distance between two adjacent partition points x_i and x_{i+1}.
(3) For $\pi\in P([0,1])$ and $f:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$, the real $S_\pi(f):=\sum_{i=0}^{M-1}f(t_i)(x_{i+1}-x_i)$ is the *Riemann sum* of f and π.
(4) A function f is *nonstandard integrable* on $[0,1]$ if

$$(\forall\pi,\pi'\in P([0,1]))\big[\|\pi\|,\|\pi'\|\approx 0\to S_\pi(f)\approx S_{\pi'}(f)\big]. \tag{3.11}$$

(5) A function f is *integrable* on $[0,1]$ if

$$(\forall k^0)(\exists N^0)(\forall\pi,\rho\in P([0,1]))\big[\|\pi\|,\|\rho\|<\tfrac{1}{N}\to|S_\pi(f)-S_\rho(f)|<\tfrac{1}{k}\big]. \tag{3.12}$$

A modulus of (Riemann) integration ω^1 provides $N=\omega(k)$ as in (3.12).

Let NSR be the statement *a standard* $f:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ *integrable on the unit interval is also* nonstandard integrable *there*. As above, NSR is a theorem of IST but we also have the following implication.

Theorem 3.16. *The system* $\mathsf{P}+\mathsf{NSR}$ *proves* Π^0_1-TRANS.

Proof. Suppose $\mathsf{NSR}\wedge\neg\Pi^0_1$-$\mathsf{TRANS}$ and note that f_0 from Theorem 3.13 is Riemann integrable. However, since the distance between $f_0(0)=e^{\frac{1}{x_0}}$ and $f_0(\sqrt{x_0})=e^{\frac{1}{2x_0}}$ is larger than any standard real, replacing 0 by $\sqrt{x_0}$ in a partition causes the associated Riemann sums to be apart by more than an infinitesimal. □

Let $\mathsf{RIE}(\kappa)$ be the statement that $\kappa(f)$ is a modulus of Riemann integration for every $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ integrable on the unit interval.

Corollary 3.17. *From the proof that* $\mathsf{P} \vdash \mathsf{NSR} \to \Pi^0_1\text{-}\mathsf{TRANS}$*, a term* t *can be extracted such that* $\mathsf{E\text{-}PA}^\omega \vdash (\forall \kappa^3)\big(\mathsf{RIE}(\kappa) \to \mathsf{MU}(t(\kappa))\big)$

Proof. The proof is straightforward and analogous to that of Corollary 3.10. □

Hence, switching from epsilon-delta integrability to the nonstandard variety as in NSR is at least as non-constructive as (μ^2) and NSC_1. One readily obtains a version of $\mathsf{NSC}_2 \to \Pi^0_1\text{-}\mathsf{TRANS}$ for NSR, i.e. for ε-δ-integrability relative to 'st'.

In conclusion, Wattenberg's claim that Nonstandard Analysis has effective (even constructive) content is correct in light of Theorem 3.5; his implementation using ε-δ continuity and *Transfer* is *problematic* in light of Theorem 3.9, but *easily salvageable*: By Theorem 3.5 it suffices to just adopt nonstandard (rather than ε-δ) continuity, in line with Osswald's local constructivity. We next investigate Wattenberg's claims regarding the constructive status of *Standard Part* in Section 3.4.

3.4. **The non-constructive status of Standard Part.** We investigate the constructive status of *Standard Part* in light of Wattenberg's claims that it be fundamentally non-constructive.

First of all, we have the following theorem regarding the use of STP, which is the only fragment of *Standard Part* used by Wattenberg in [37].

Theorem 3.18. *Let* φ *be internal. From* $\mathsf{P}_0 + \mathsf{STP} \vdash (\forall^{\mathrm{st}} x)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} y)\varphi(x,y)$*, a term* t *can be extracted such that* $\mathsf{RCA}^\omega_0 \vdash (\forall \Theta^3)\big(\mathsf{SCF}(\Theta) \to (\forall x)(\exists y \in t(x,\Theta))\varphi(x,y)\big)$.

Proof. Note that STP is equivalent to (2.19) form Section 2.5.3 by Theorem 4.4. The theorem now follows easily by following the proof of Corollary 3.10. □

In light of the previous theorem, the use of STP in the proof of a nonstandard theorem translates to the presence of the *special fan functional* Θ after applying Theorem 2.4. Given the computational hardness of Θ, Wattenberg's claims regarding the non-constructive nature of Standard Part seem justified. However, as will be established in Section 4.2, the fragment of *Standard Part* used by Wattenberg (namely STP from Section 2.5.3) does have plenty of effective content, though extra technical machinery is needed for this.

Secondly, we show that the generalisation of STP to type two functionals is non-constructive as it implies $(\exists^2)$. In particular, the following rather weak fragment of *Standard part* is established to be non-constructive by Theorem 3.19.

$$(\forall Y^2 \leq_2 1)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} Z^2 \leq_2 1)(Z \approx_2 Y). \tag{STP_2}$$

Note that $(\mathsf{E})^{\mathrm{st}}_{n+2}$ results in a conservative extension of P_0 as shown in [4].

Theorem 3.19. *The system* $\mathsf{P}_0 + (\mathsf{E})^{\mathrm{st}}_2 + \mathsf{STP}_2$ *proves* $(\exists^2)^{\mathrm{st}}$.

Proof. In a nutshell, we work relative to 'st' in $\mathsf{P}_0 + (\mathsf{E})^{\mathrm{st}}_2 + \mathsf{STP}_2$ and define a functional which computes the separating set in Σ^0_1-separation ([33, I.11.7]). The theorem then follows from the equivalence between the uniform version of Σ^0_1-separation and $(\exists^2)$, as proved in [27, Theorem 3.6].

Let f_1, f_2 be standard binary sequences and fix nonstandard N^0. Let $K(n, f_1, f_2)$ be the largest $k^0 \leq N$ such that $(\forall n_1, n_2 \leq k)(f_1(n_1, n) \neq 0 \vee f_2(n_2, n) \neq 0)$, if such number exists, and zero otherwise. Define Y^2 as follows:

$$Y(f_1, f_2, n) := \begin{cases} 1 & (\exists n_1 \leq K(n, f_1, f_2))(f_1(n_1, n) = 0) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Now suppose $(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} n^0)(\neg\varphi_1^{\mathrm{st}}(n) \vee \neg\varphi_2^{\mathrm{st}}(n))$ where $\varphi_i(n) \equiv (\exists n_i)(f(n_i, n) = 0)$. By overspill, $K(n, f_1, f_2)$ is nonstandard for all standard n^0. By definition, we have

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} n^0)\big[\varphi_1^{\mathrm{st}}(n) \to Y(f_1, f_2, n) = 1 \wedge \varphi_2^{\mathrm{st}}(n) \to Y(f_1, f_2, n) = 0\big].$$

Now apply STP_2 to obtain standard Z^2 such that $Z \approx_2 Y$. Then $Z(f_1, f_2, n)$ is standard and provides the separating set from Σ_1^0-separation for standard inputs and relative to 'st'. □

We provide an alternative proof for Theorem 3.19 as follows.

Proof. We prove that $\mathsf{STP}_2 \to \mathsf{UWKL}^{\mathrm{st}}$ in P, where UWKL is as follows:

$$(\exists \Phi^{1\to 1})(\forall T^1 \leq_1 1)\big[(\forall n^0)(\exists \beta^0)(\beta \in T \wedge |\beta| = n) \to (\forall m^0)(\overline{\Phi(T)}m \in T)\big]. \quad (3.13)$$

As proved in [15], UWKL implies $(\exists^2)$, and the latter proof immediately transfers to $\mathsf{P}_0 + (\mathsf{E})_2^{\mathrm{st}}$, yielding that $\mathsf{STP}_2 \to (\exists^2)^{\mathrm{st}}$. Fix a standard binary tree T.

Apply overspill to $(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} n^0)(\exists \beta^0)(\beta \in T \wedge |\beta| = n)$ to obtain a sequence in T of nonstandard length, say N. Now define $\Phi(T)(0)$ as 0 (resp. 1) if there is a sequence $\beta^{0^*} \in T$ of length N such that $\beta(0) = 0$ (resp. if this is not the case). Then define $\Phi(T)(n+1)$ as $\Phi(T)(0) * \ldots \Phi(T)(n) * 0$ (resp. $\cdots * 1$) if there is a sequence $\beta^{0^*} \in T$ of length N such that $\Phi(T)(0) * \ldots \Phi(T)(n) * 0 = \overline{\beta}(n+1)$ (resp. if this is not the case). By STP_2, there is standard Ψ such that $\Phi(f) \approx_1 \Psi(f)$ for standard $f^1 \leq_1 1$, and $\mathsf{STP}_2 \to \mathsf{UWKL}^{\mathrm{st}}$ follows immediately. □

In conclusion, the previous theorem suggests that the axiom *Standard Part* is *in general* fundamentally non-constructive, as claimed by Wattenberg. Moreover, since $(\mathsf{E})_{n+2}^{\mathrm{st}}$ readily follows from *Transfer*, Theorem 3.19 is especially relevant when a proof utilises both *Transfer* and *Standard Part*.

4. Compactness

We discuss Wattenberg's treatment from [37, III] of compactness (Sections 4.1 and 4.2) and the associated extreme value theorem (Section 4.3).

4.1. Constructive compactness and Nonstandard Analysis.

Wattenberg describes the following form of compactness as 'acceptable' in [37, III.4]. As we will see, his choice of compactness is indeed most suitable for obtaining constructive or effective results.

Definition 4.1. [F-compactness] A metric space X is *F-compact* if there is a standard sequence $x_{(\cdot)}$ such that $(\forall x \in X)(\forall N^0 \in \Omega)(\exists k \leq N)(|x_k - x|_X \approx 0)$.

Note that inside P (and extensions), the unit interval and Cantor space are F-compact, but not necessarily nonstandard compact (as $\mathsf{P}+\Pi_1^0\text{-}\mathsf{TRANS} \nvdash \mathsf{STP}$ by [20, §4]). In particular, nonstandard compactness guarantees the infinitesimal proximity of a *standard* point, while F-compactness states the presence of an 'infinitesimal grid' of *nonstandard* points. Thus, F-compactness expresses the intuitive notion

that a compact space 'can be divided into infinitesimal pieces', a mainstay of the infinitesimal calculus used in physics and engineering. The notion of F-compactness for special cases has been studied in [29].

We first prove a basic result regarding F-compactness. Note that the latter provides a kind of 'discretisation' of the space X as used in an essential way for the unit interval in the steps (i)-(iv) at the beginning of Section 3.2.

Theorem 4.2 ($\mathsf{FC}_{\mathbb{R}}$)**.** *An F-compact $X \subset \mathbb{R}$ has a supremum, i.e. for all standard $x_{(\cdot)}$ and any $X \subset \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$(\forall x \in X)(\forall N^0 \in \Omega)(\exists k \leq N)(x_k \approx x) \to (\forall x \in X)(\forall N \in \Omega)(x \lessapprox t(x_{(\cdot)}, N))),$$

where $t(x_{(\cdot)}, N) := \max_{i \leq N} x_i$.

Note that Ω-CA converts $t(x_{(\cdot)}, N)$ from the theorem into a *standard* supremum.

The constructive version of the previous theorem is [5, Theorem 3, p. 34]. The latter version involves the notion of 'totally boundedness' as in the antecedent of (4.1), which 'falls out' of the notion of F-compactness by the following theorem.

Theorem 4.3. *From a proof $\mathsf{P}_0 \vdash \mathsf{FC}_{\mathbb{R}}$, a term s can be extracted such RCA_0^ω proves that for any $x_{(\cdot)}$ and $X \subset \mathbb{R}$ and g^1, we have*

$$(\forall k^0, x \in X)(\exists n \leq g(k))(|x_n - x| <_{\mathbb{R}} \tfrac{1}{k}) \to (\forall x \in X)(x \leq_{\mathbb{R}} \sup_X(x_{(\cdot)}))), \quad (4.1)$$

where the real in the consequent is defined by $\sup_X(x_{(\cdot)})(k) := t(x_{(\cdot)}, s(x_{(\cdot)}, 2^k))$.

Proof. The nonstandard proof is trivial. For the remaining part, one readily proves using underspill that $(\forall x \in X)(\forall N^0 \in \Omega)(\exists k \leq N)(x_k \approx x)$ has the normal form

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} l^0)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} M^0)(\forall x \in X)(\exists k \leq M)(|x_k - x| < \tfrac{1}{l}).$$

Similarly, a normal form for $(\forall x \in X)(\forall N \in \Omega)(x \lessapprox t(x_{(\cdot)}, N)))$ is as follows:

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} k^0)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} M^0)(\forall x \in X)(x \leq t(x_{(\cdot)}, M)) + \tfrac{1}{k}).$$

Given these normal forms, Theorem 2.4 now readily yields the theorem. □

The function g in the antecedent of (4.1) is a *modulus of totally boundedness*.

Admittedly, the previous result is rather basic but our aim was to show that (a) F-compactness is converted to totally boundedness, the preferred constructive component of compactness, as in the antecedent of (4.1), and (b) that Wattenberg correctly identifies F-compactness as having 'constructive potential' in [37, III].

With regard to (b), we now show that F-compactness cannot be (immediately) replaced with nonstandard compactness as in STP or $\mathsf{STP}_{\mathbb{R}}$. To this end, we first prove that STP and $\mathsf{STP}_{\mathbb{R}}$ have equivalent normal forms as noted in Section 2.5. Note that a version of this theorem *not involving* $\mathsf{STP}_{\mathbb{R}}$ may be found in [20].

Theorem 4.4. *In P, STP is equivalent to $\mathsf{STP}_{\mathbb{R}}$ and to the normal forms*

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} g^2)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} w^{1^*}, k^0)(\forall T^1 \leq_1 1)\big[(\forall \alpha^1 \in w)(\overline{\alpha}g(\alpha) \notin T) \to (\forall \beta \leq_1 1)(\exists i \leq k)(\overline{\beta}i \notin T)\big], \quad (4.2)$$

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} g^2)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} w^{1^*}, k)(\forall z \in \mathbb{R})\big[\big(\forall y \in (w \cap [0,1])\big)(|y - z| >_{\mathbb{R}} \tfrac{1}{g(y)}) \to (\forall x \in [0,1])(|x - z| >_{\mathbb{R}} \tfrac{1}{k})\big]. \quad (4.3)$$

Proof. We first prove that STP and $\mathsf{STP}_{\mathbb{R}}$ are equivalent. Now, Hirst establishes in [8] that RCA_0 proves that every real $x \in [0,1]$ has a binary expansion, i.e. $(\forall x \in [0,1])(\exists \alpha^1 \leq_1 1)(x =_{\mathbb{R}} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha(i)}{2^i})$. Since P_0 proves the latter (both the internal version and the version relative to 'st'), it is clear that $\mathsf{STP} \leftrightarrow \mathsf{STP}_{\mathbb{R}}$.

Secondly, we prove that STP is equivalent to

$$(\forall T^1 \leq_1 1)\big[(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} n)(\exists \beta^0)(|\beta| = n \wedge \beta \in T) \rightarrow (\exists^{\mathrm{st}} \alpha^1 \leq_1 1)(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} n^0)(\overline{\alpha} n \in T)\big]. \tag{4.4}$$

Assume STP and apply overspill to $(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} n)(\exists \beta^0)(|\beta| = n \wedge \beta \in T)$ to obtain $\beta_0^0 \in T$ with nonstandard length $|\beta_0|$. Now apply STP to $\beta^1 := \beta_0 * 00\ldots$ to obtain a *standard* $\alpha^1 \leq_1 1$ such that $\alpha \approx_1 \beta$ and hence $(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} n)(\overline{\alpha} n \in T)$. For the reverse direction, let f^1 be a binary sequence, and define a binary tree T_f which contains all initial segments of f. Now apply (4.4) for $T = T_f$ to obtain STP.

Thirdly, assume STP and note that the contraposition of (4.4) yields:

$$(\forall T^1 \leq_1 1)\big[(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} \alpha \leq_1 1)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} n^0)(\overline{\alpha} n \notin T) \rightarrow (\exists^{\mathrm{st}} k^0)(\forall \beta \leq_1 1)(\exists i \leq k)(\overline{\beta} i \notin T)\big]. \tag{4.5}$$

Since standard functionals have standard output for standard input, (4.5) implies:

$$(\forall T^1 \leq_1 1)(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} g^2)\big[(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} \alpha \leq_1 1)(\overline{\alpha} g(\alpha) \notin T) \rightarrow (\exists^{\mathrm{st}} k^0)(\forall \beta \leq_1 1)(\exists i \leq k)(\overline{\beta} i \notin T)\big]. \tag{4.6}$$

Pushing all standard quantifiers outside as far as possible, we obtain that

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} g^2)(\forall T^1 \leq_1 1)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} k^0, \alpha^1 \leq_1 1)\big[(\overline{\alpha} g(\alpha) \notin T) \rightarrow (\forall \beta \leq_1 1)(\exists i \leq k)(\overline{\beta} i \notin T)\big]. \tag{4.7}$$

Applying *Idealisation* I, we pull the standard quantifiers to the front as follows:

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} g^2)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} w^{1^*})(\forall T^1 \leq_1 1)(\exists (\alpha^1 \leq_1 1, k^0) \in w)\big[(\overline{\alpha} g(\alpha) \notin T) \rightarrow (\forall \beta \leq_1 1)(\exists i \leq k)(\overline{\beta} i \notin T)\big]. \tag{4.8}$$

Now assume (4.8) and note that since w is standard, all of its elements are, implying (4.7). Bringing all standard quantifiers inside again (as far as possible), we obtain (4.6). We now immediately obtain (4.5) by noting that $(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} \alpha \leq_1 1)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} n^0)(\overline{\alpha} n \notin T)$ implies $(\exists^{\mathrm{st}} \Phi^{1 \to 0^*})(\forall^{\mathrm{st}} \alpha \leq_1 1)(\exists n^0 \in \Phi(\alpha))(\overline{\alpha} n \notin T)$ by applying $\mathsf{HAC}_{\mathsf{int}}$ and defining $g(\alpha) := \max_{i < |\Phi(\alpha)|} \Phi(\alpha)(i)$ as in Remark 2.10. □

In conclusion, STP is equivalent to the normal form (4.2), and term extraction as in Theorem 2.4 converts the latter to the special fan functional introduced in Section 2.5. Since the latter boasts extreme computational hardness, it indeed seems better to avoid nonstandard compactness STP in favour of F-compactness. In the next section, we will show how computational content can still be obtained from STP and the special fan functional.

4.2. **The constructive status of nonstandard compactness.** We investigate *Standard Part* in light of Wattenberg's claims that it be fundamentally non-constructive. By Theorem 3.19, a rather small fragment of *Standard part* is indeed fundamentally non-constructive. By contrast, we show in this section that STP, which is the particular fragment Wattenberg uses in [37, II-III], still yields constructive content, after some extra technical steps. This section is somewhat more technical in nature as we assume familiarity with the ECF-translation from [35, §2.6.5].

First of all, nonstandard continuity (2.13) clearly yields *uniform* nonstandard continuity (2.15) for the unit interval inside $\mathsf{P}_0 + \mathsf{STP}$ by Theorem 4.4. Thus, the following version of IVT is immediate where the term t is as in (4.11).

Theorem 4.5 ($\mathsf{IVT}'_{\mathsf{wat}}$)**.** *For nonstandard N^0 and nonstandard continuous $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(0) <_{\mathbb{R}} 0 <_{\mathbb{R}} f(1)$, $t(f,N) \in [0,1] \wedge f(t(f,N)) \approx 0$.*

We now show that this nonstandard version yields the following effective version.

Theorem 4.6 ($\mathsf{IVT}'_{\mathsf{ef}}(s)$)**.** *For k^0 and $f : [a,b] \to \mathbb{R}$ continuous with modulus g and such that $f(a) <_{\mathbb{R}} 0 <_{\mathbb{R}} f(b)$, we have $|f(s(f,g,k))| <_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{k}$.*

Theorem 4.7. *From the proof of $\mathsf{IVT}'_{\mathsf{wat}}$ in $\mathsf{P}_0 + \mathsf{STP}$, a term u can be extracted such that RCA_0^ω proves $(\forall \Theta^3)\big(\mathsf{SCF}(\Theta) \to \mathsf{IVT}'_{\mathsf{ef}}(u(\Theta))\big)$.*

Proof. Since P_0 proves $\mathsf{IVT}_{\mathsf{wat}}$ by Theorem 3.19, $\mathsf{P}_0 + \mathsf{STP}$ proves $\mathsf{IVT}'_{\mathsf{wat}}$, as in the latter system every nonstandard continuous function is automatically *uniform* nonstandard continuous on the unit interval by $\mathsf{STP}_{\mathbb{R}}$ and Theorem 4.4. To obtain the effective results from the theorem, one just proceeds as in Theorem 3.5 using the normal form (4.2) of STP. □

Secondly, Theorem 4.7 is not very satisfactory as the special fan functional is not computable (in the sense of Kleene's S1-S9) in e.g. $(\exists^2)$, or even the Suslin functional (See [20, §3] for these results). However, the following observation ([13, §2]) by Kohlenbach will be seen to solve this problem in Theorem 4.9:

$$\text{If } \mathsf{RCA}_0^\omega \vdash A \text{ then } \mathsf{RCA}_0^2 \vdash [A]_{\mathsf{ECF}}. \tag{4.9}$$

Here, RCA_0^2 is essentially the base theory RCA_0 of Reverse Mathematics ([33, II]) formulated with function rather than set variables; the syntactical interpretation $[\,\cdot\,]_{\mathsf{ECF}}$ is defined in [35, §2.6.5] and is based on the Kleene-Kreisel model of continuous functionals. In the latter, higher-type objects are represented by so-called *associates* which is equivalent to the representation used in Reverse Mathematics by [14, Prop. 4.4] of continuous functionals on Baire space.

In a nutshell, the ECF-translation amounts to replacing all objects of type two or higher by *type one* associates. Applying ECF as in (4.9) to the final part of Theorem 4.7, we shall observe that the special fan functional is converted into a 'more computable' object. We now introduce the definition of associate for a type two functional from [14], and study the intuitionistic fan functional as an example.

Definition 4.8. [Associate] The function α^1 is an *associate* for continuous Φ^2 if

(1) $(\forall \beta^1)(\exists n^0)(\alpha(\overline{\beta}n) > 0)$,
(2) $(\forall \beta^1, m^0)(\alpha(\overline{\beta}m) > 0 \to \Phi(\beta) + 1 = \alpha(\overline{\beta}m))$.

One often writes $\alpha(\beta)$, to be understood as $\alpha(\overline{\beta}m)-1$ for large enough m as in the first item. Given an associate α^1 for Φ^2, an associate γ^1 for Ψ^3 is now defined such that $\Psi(\Phi)$ is $\gamma(\alpha)$ where the latter is again $\gamma(\overline{\alpha}k)-1$ for large enough k.

By way of an example, consider the intuitionistic fan functional as in $\mathsf{MUC}(\Omega)$ from Section 2.5.3. Following the heuristic that all objects of type two or higher are replaced by associates by ECF, it is straightforward to see that $[\mathsf{MUC}(\Omega)]_{\mathsf{ECF}}$ is:

$$(\forall \alpha^1)\Big[\underline{(\forall f^1)(\exists n^0)(\alpha(\overline{f}n)>0)} \to \big((\exists m^0)(\gamma(\overline{\alpha}m)>0)\wedge \qquad (\mathsf{TOF}(\gamma^1))$$
$$(\forall g^1,h^1\leq_1 1,k^0)([\gamma(\overline{\alpha}k)>0\wedge \overline{h}\gamma(\overline{\alpha}k)=_0 \overline{g}\gamma(\overline{\alpha}k)]\to \alpha(h)=\alpha(g)>0)\big)\Big].$$

The underlined formula expresses that α^1 is an associate representing a (continuous) functional Y^2, while $\mathsf{TOF}(\gamma)$ expresses that γ^1 is an associate for the intuitionistic fan functional, i.e. $\Omega(Y)$ as in $\mathsf{MUC}(\Omega)$ is given by $\gamma(\alpha)$, and the rest of $\mathsf{TOF}(\gamma)$ ensures that $\gamma(\alpha)$ makes sense.

Note that if a functional Φ^2 has an associate as in Definition 4.8, it is *automatically* continuous on Baire space. Thus, since μ^2 as in (μ^2) is discontinuous (e.g. at $00\dots$), $[(\mu^2)]_{\mathsf{ECF}}$ is equivalent to $0=1$. In particular, we observe that the ECF-translation replaces *any* type two variable with a type one variable over associates, i.e. the new variable ranges over (representations of) *continuous* functionals.

As a result of the aforementioned 'continuous replacement', WKL is equivalent $(\exists\gamma^1)\mathsf{TOF}(\gamma)$, and the latter is of course $[(\exists\Omega^3)\mathsf{MUC}(\Omega)]_{\mathsf{ECF}}$. As it turns out, the intuitionistic fan functional even has a *primitive recursive* associate $\widehat{\mathsf{FAN}}$ which may be found in [19, p. 102]. We thus also have $\mathsf{WKL}\leftrightarrow\mathsf{TOF}(\widehat{\mathsf{FAN}})$ (See [16, §7.3.4]). The following theorem shows that the special fan functional becomes 'more computable' thanks to ECF. We shall make use of the nonstandard axiom

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}}Y^2)(\forall f^1,g^1\leq_1 1)(f\approx_1 g\to Y(f)=_0 Y(g)), \qquad (\mathsf{NUC})$$

Note that NUC expresses that every type two functional is nonstandard uniformly continuous on Cantor space, akin to Brouwer's continuity theorem ([6]).

Theorem 4.9. *From* $\mathsf{P}_0\vdash\mathsf{NUC}\to\mathsf{STP}$*, terms* t_0,t_1 *can be extracted such that* $\mathsf{RCA}_0^\omega\vdash(\forall\Omega)(\mathsf{MUC}(\Omega)\to\mathsf{SCF}(t_0(\Omega)))$ *and* $\mathsf{RCA}_0^2+\mathsf{WKL}\vdash[\mathsf{SCF}]_{\mathsf{ECF}}(t_1(\widehat{\mathsf{FAN}}))$.

Proof. As in Theorem 3.5, the normal form of NUC is readily obtained as follows:

$$(\forall^{\mathrm{st}}Y^2)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}}N)(\forall f^1,g^1\leq_1 1)(\overline{f}N=\overline{g}N\to Y(f)=_0 Y(g)), \qquad (4.10)$$

Applying $\mathsf{HAC}_{\mathsf{int}}$ to (4.10) as in Remark 2.10 yields that

$$(\exists^{\mathrm{st}}\Omega^3)(\forall^{\mathrm{st}}Y^2)(\exists^{\mathrm{st}}N)(\forall f^1,g^1\leq_1 1)(\overline{f}\Omega(Y)=\overline{g}\Omega(Y)\to Y(f)=_0 Y(g)).$$

To obtain the nonstandard implication, note that STP is equivalent to (4.2) and define k^0 as in the latter as the (clearly standard) maximum of $g(\sigma*00)$ for all binary σ^{0^*} of length $\Omega(g)+1$, while w^1 is the (standard) collection of all $\sigma_i*00\dots$ where the binary $\sigma_i^{0^*}$ has length $\Omega(g)+1$. Hence, NUC implies (4.2) and hence STP. Since NUC and STP have normal forms (4.10) and (4.2), applying term extraction as in Theorem 2.4 to $\mathsf{P}_0\vdash[\mathsf{NUC}\to\mathsf{STP}]$ readily yields the term t_0 from the theorem.

Finally, applying the ECF-translation as in (4.9) to $\mathsf{RCA}_0^\omega\vdash(\forall\Omega)(\mathsf{MUC}(\Omega)\to\mathsf{SCF}(t_0(\Omega)))$, we obtain that $\mathsf{RCA}_0^2\vdash[(\forall\Omega)(\mathsf{MUC}(\Omega)\to\mathsf{SCF}(t_0(\Omega)))]_{\mathsf{ECF}}$, which

becomes $\mathsf{RCA}_0^2 \vdash (\forall \gamma^1)(\mathsf{TOF}(\gamma) \to [\mathsf{SCF}]_{\mathsf{ECF}}(t_1(\gamma)))$ as $[\mathsf{MUC}(\Omega)]_{\mathsf{ECF}}$ is $\mathsf{TOF}(\gamma)$. Since $\mathsf{WKL} \leftrightarrow \mathsf{TOF}(\widehat{\mathsf{FAN}})$ by [16, §7.3.4], the theorem now follows. □

Note that parts of Theorem 4.9 may be found in [20, 28]. We have the following corollary pertaining to Theorem 4.7.

Corollary 4.10. *From the proof of* $\mathsf{IVT}'_{\mathsf{wat}}$ *in* $\mathsf{P}_0 + \mathsf{STP}$*, a term* v^1 *can be extracted such that* $\mathsf{RCA}_0^2 + \mathsf{WKL}$ *proves* $[\mathsf{IVT}'_{\mathsf{ef}}]_{\mathsf{ECF}}(v(\widehat{\mathsf{FAN}}))\big)$.

Proof. Apply the ECF-translation to the conclusion of Theorem 4.7. □

Note that WKL is non-constructive, but the term $v(\widehat{\mathsf{FAN}})$ is computable. Furthermore, the only real modification the ECF-translation bestows upong the intermediate value theorem from Theorem 4.7 is the replacement of continuous functions by associates (which can always be done given WKL by [14, Theorem 4.6]).

In conclusion, we have observed that STP is indeed non-constructive in nature in that it gives rise to the special fan functional as in Theorem 4.7. However, a somewhat technical detour (using the ECF-interpretation) still yields computational information as in Corollary 4.10.

4.3. **Extreme value theorem.** We briefly discuss Wattenberg's treatment from [37, III] of Weierstraß' extreme value theorem inside Nonstandard Analysis.

4.3.1. *Preliminaries.* The extreme value theorem (WMX) is a basic result from calculus and can be formulated as follows.

Theorem 4.11 (WMX)**.** *Suppose that* X *is compact and that* $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ *is continuous. Then there is* $x \in X$ *such that* $(\forall y \in X)(f(y) \leq_{\mathbb{R}} f(x))$.

As is well-known, WMX implies a non-trivial fragment of the law of excluded middle (See e.g. [2, I.6] or [17]) and is therefore rejected in constructive mathematics. A slight modification of Wattenberg's nonstandard version of WMX will be shown to yield the following *effective* version in Section 4.3.2, similar to [5, p. 89].

Theorem 4.12 ($\mathsf{WMX}_{\mathsf{ef}}(s)$)**.** *For* k^0 *and* $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ *uniformly continuous with modulus* g *on the compact space* X *with modulus of totally boundedness* h*, we have* $(\forall x \in X)(f(x) \leq_{\mathbb{R}} f(s(f, g, h, k)) + \frac{1}{k})$.

Note that this version no longer involves Nonstandard Analysis. Furthermore, the term s is 'read off' from the (modified) Wattenberg proof. Thus, Wattenberg's claims about the effective content of Nonstandard Analysis are again at least partially correct. One the other hand, Wattenberg explicitly uses *Transfer* in the proof of [37, III.6], which is problematic if one is interested in computational content, as was established above.

4.3.2. *Constructive extreme value theorem and Nonstandard Analysis.* Wattenberg proves various nonstandard versions of WMX inside Nonstandard Analysis in [37, III.7]. He refers to (a trivial reformulation of) the Theorem 4.13 below as

a completely "constructive" version of the Extreme Value Theorem

in [37, p. 308]. Note that Wattenberg uses the notion of an 'implementation' (See [37, Def. III.8]) rather than nonstandard uniform continuity, although both essentially amount to the same thing in this context.

Theorem 4.13 ($\mathsf{WMX}_{\mathsf{wat}}$)**.** *For nonstandard N^0, F-compact X with standard sequence $x_{(\cdot)}$, and nonstandard uniformly continuous $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$, we have $(\forall x \in X)(f(x) \lessapprox f(t(x_{(\cdot)}, N)))$.*

The term $t^{((1\to1)\times0)\to0}$ from the theorem is defined as follows (where $h := \frac{b-a}{N}$):

$$t(f,N) := \begin{cases} (\mu j \leq N)\big([f(jh)](2^N) \leq_0 0\big)h & \text{if such exists} \\ N+1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \tag{4.11}$$

Wattenberg proves $\mathsf{WMX}_{\mathsf{wat}}$ in [37, III.7] using (what amounts to) the following:

(i) Fix a standard sequence $x_{(\cdot)}$ and nonstandard N^0 as provided by the F-compactness of X.
(ii) Define $t_0 := x_0$ and $t_{n+1} := t_n$ if $f(x_{n+1}) \lessapprox f(t_n)$ and $t_{n+1} = x_{n+1}$ if $f(x_{n+1}) \gtrapprox f(t_n)$. Note that for $n \leq N$, we have $f(x_n) \lessapprox f(t_N)$.
(iii) Since for every $x \in X$ there is $j \leq N$ such that $x_j \approx x$, we have $(\forall x \in X)(f(x) \lessapprox f(t_N))$ by continuity.

Note that item (iii) makes use of *uniform* nonstandard continuity. When working in IST, one would apply STP to t_N to obtain a *standard* maximum for f. Note that a similar remark regarding Ω-CA as in Remark 3.7 applies to $\mathsf{WMX}_{\mathsf{wat}}$.

Finally, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 4.14. *From the proof of $\mathsf{WMX}_{\mathsf{wat}}$ in P_0, a term u can be extracted such that RCA_0^ω proves $\mathsf{WMX}_{\mathsf{ef}}(u)$.*

Proof. The proof of $\mathsf{WMX}_{\mathsf{wat}}$ inside P_0 follows from the above steps (i)-(iii), assuming we use approximations (say up to precision 2^N for N from item (i)) to $f(x_i)$ and $f(t_i)$. One then applies Theorem 2.4 to $\mathsf{P}_0 \vdash \mathsf{WMX}_{\mathsf{wat}}$ to obtain the term u from the theorem, following Template 3.6. □

References

[1] Sergio Albeverio, Raphael Høegh-Krohn, Jens Erik Fenstad, and Tom Lindstrøm, *Nonstandard methods in stochastic analysis and mathematical physics*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 122, Academic Press, 1986.
[2] Michael J. Beeson, *Foundations of constructive mathematics*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, vol. 6, Springer, 1985. Metamathematical studies.
[3] Benno van den Berg, Eyvind Briseid, and Pavol Safarik, *A functional interpretation for nonstandard arithmetic*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **163** (2012), no. 12, 1962–1994.
[4] Benno van den Berg and Sam Sanders, *Transfer equals Comprehension*, Submitted (2014). Available on arXiv: `http://arxiv.org/abs/1409.6881`.
[5] Errett Bishop, *Foundations of constructive analysis*, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1967.
[6] L. E. J. Brouwer, *Collected works. Vol. 1*, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1975. Philosophy and foundations of mathematics; Edited by A. Heyting.
[7] Damir D. Dzhafarov, *Reverse Mathematics Zoo*. `http://rmzoo.uconn.edu/`.
[8] Jeffry L. Hirst, *Representations of reals in reverse mathematics*, Bull. Pol. Acad. Sci. Math. **55** (2007), no. 4, 303–316.
[9] Anton Jensen, *A computer oriented version of "non-standard analysis"*, Contributions to non-standard analysis (Sympos., Oberwolfach, 1970), North-Holland, 1972, pp. 281–289. Studies in Logic and Found. Math., Vol. 69.
[10] Albert E. Hurd and Peter A. Loeb, *An introduction to nonstandard real analysis*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 118, Academic Press Inc., Orlando, FL, 1985.
[11] H. Jerome Keisler, *The hyperreal line*, Real numbers, generalizations of the reals, and theories of continua, Synthese Lib., vol. 242, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1994, pp. 207–237.
[12] Ulrich Kohlenbach, *Applied proof theory: proof interpretations and their use in mathematics*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2008.

[13] ———, *Higher order reverse mathematics*, Reverse mathematics 2001, Lect. Notes Log., vol. 21, ASL, 2005, pp. 281–295.
[14] ———, *Foundational and mathematical uses of higher types*, Reflections on the foundations of mathematics (Stanford, CA, 1998), Lect. Notes Log., vol. 15, ASL, 2002, pp. 92–116.
[15] ———, *On uniform weak König's lemma*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **114** (2002), no. 1-3, 103–116. Commemorative Symposium Dedicated to Anne S. Troelstra (Noordwijkerhout, 1999).
[16] John Longley and Dag Normann, *Higher-order Computability*, Theory and Applications of Computability, Springer, 2015.
[17] Mark Mandelkern, *Constructive continuity*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **42** (1983), v+117.
[18] Edward Nelson, *Internal set theory: a new approach to nonstandard analysis*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **83** (1977), no. 6, 1165–1198.
[19] Dag Normann, *Recursion on the countable functionals*, LNM 811, vol. 811, Springer, 1980.
[20] Dag Normann and Sam Sanders, *Nonstandard Analysis, Computability Theory, and their connections*, Submitted, Available from arXiv: `https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.06556` (2017).
[21] Horst Osswald, *Computation of the kernels of Lévy functionals and applications*, Illinois Journal of Mathematics **55** (2011), no. 3, 815–833.
[22] ———, *Malliavin calculus for Lévy processes and infinite-dimensional Brownian motion*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 191, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.
[23] Erik Palmgren, *Constructive nonstandard analysis*, Méthodes et analyse non standard, Cahiers Centre Logique, vol. 9, Acad.-Bruylant, Louvain-la-Neuve, 1996, pp. 69–97.
[24] David A. Ross, *A nonstandard proof of a lemma from constructive measure theory*, MLQ Math. Log. Q. **52** (2006), no. 5, 494–497.
[25] ———, *The constructive content of nonstandard measure existence proofs—is there any?*, Reuniting the antipodes—constructive and nonstandard views of the continuum (Venice, 1999), Synthese Lib., vol. 306, Kluwer, 2001, pp. 229–239.
[26] Abraham Robinson, *Non-standard analysis*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1966.
[27] Nobuyuki Sakamoto and Takeshi Yamazaki, *Uniform versions of some axioms of second order arithmetic*, MLQ Math. Log. Q. **50** (2004), no. 6, 587–593.
[28] Sam Sanders, *The Gandy-Hyland functional and the computational aspect of Nonstandard Analysis*, To appear in *Computability*, `http://arxiv.org/abs/1502.03622` (2017).
[29] ———, *The unreasonable effectiveness of Nonstandard Analysis*, Submitted; Available from arXiv: `http://arxiv.org/abs/1508.07434` (2015).
[30] ———, *The taming of the Reverse Mathematics zoo*, Submitted, `http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.2022` (2015).
[31] ———, *The refining of the taming of the Reverse Mathematics zoo*, To appear in Notre Dame Journal for Formal Logic, `http://arxiv.org/abs/1602.02270` (2016).
[32] Peter Schuster, Ulrich Berger, and Horst Osswald (eds.), *Reuniting the antipodes: constructive and nonstandard views of the continuum*, Synthese Library, vol. 306, Kluwer, 2001.
[33] Stephen G. Simpson, *Subsystems of second order arithmetic*, 2nd ed., Perspectives in Logic, CUP, 2009.
[34] Patrick Suppes and Rolando Chuaqui, *A finitarily consistent free-variable positive fragment of Infinitesimal Analysis*, Proceedings of the IXth Latin American Symposium on Mathematical Logic Notas de Logica Mathematica **38** (1993), 1-59.
[35] Anne Sjerp Troelstra, *Metamathematical investigation of intuitionistic arithmetic and analysis*, Springer Berlin, 1973. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 344.
[36] Martin Väth, *Nonstandard analysis*, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2007.
[37] F. Wattenberg, *Nonstandard analysis and constructivism?*, Studia Logica **47** (1988), 303–309.
[38] Manfred Wolff and Peter A. Loeb (eds.), *Nonstandard analysis for the working mathematician*, Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 510, Kluwer, 2015. Second edition.